

वरेन्द्र-अनुसन्धान-समिति-ग्रन्थमाला

---

# काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य्यश्रीजिनेन्द्रबुद्धिपादविरचिता

शास्त्रिश्रीश्रीशचन्द्रचक्रवर्तिभट्टाचार्य्येण संस्कृता ।

---

THE

## KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKA (THE NYASA)

A COMMENTARY ON VAMANA-JAYADITYA'S KASIKA

BY

JINENDRA BUDDHI.

---

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION AND OCCASIONAL NOTES

---

BY

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI, B A

READER OF SANSKRIT, DACCA UNIVERSITY.

---

Vol. I

( Adhyayas 1—4 ).

---

PUBLISHED BY

THE VARENDRA RESEARCH SOCIETY,  
RAJSHAHI, BENGAL

---

1913—1916

[All rights reserved]

वरेन्द्र-अनुसन्धान-समिति-ग्रन्थमाला

---

# काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्यश्रीजिनेन्द्रबुद्धिपादविरचिता

शास्त्रिश्रीश्रीशचन्द्रचक्रवर्तिभट्टाचार्येण संस्कृता ।

---

THE

## KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKĀ (THE NYĀSA)

A COMMENTARY ON VĀMANA-JAYADITYA'S KASIKA

BY

JINENDRA BUDDHL

---

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION AND OCCASIONAL NOTES

BY

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI, B. A.

READER OF SANSKRIT, DACCA UNIVERSITY.

Vol. II. Part I.

(Adhyaya 5).

---

PUBLISHED BY

THE VARENDRA RESEARCH SOCIETY

RAJSHAHI, BENGAL

---

1919

[All rights reserved].



वरेन्द्र-अनुसन्धान-समिति-ग्रन्थमाला

---

# काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्यश्रीजिनेन्द्रबुद्धिपादविरचिता

शास्त्रिश्रीश्रीशचन्द्रचक्रवर्त्तिभट्टाचार्येण संस्कृता ।

---

THE

## KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKĀ (THE NYĀSA)

A COMMENTARY ON VĀMAĀNA-JĀYĀDITYĀ'S KĀSIKA

BY

JINENDRA BUDDHI.

---

EDITED

WITH INTRODUCTION AND OCCASIONAL NOTES

BY

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI, B A

READER OF SANSKRIT, DACCA UNIVERSITY

**Vol. II. Part II.**

( Adhyaya 6 )

---

PUBLISHED BY

THE VARENDRA RESEARCH SOCIETY,

RAJSHAHI, BENGAL

---

1924

[All rights reserved]



# KASIKĀ VĪVARĀNA PĀNĪKĀ

## Vol II

### शुद्धिपत्रम्

पृष्ठायाम्	पङ्क्तौ	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
५४	२४	लशून	लशुन
८४	२५	कश्चिन् · कश्चित्	क्वचिन् · क्वचित्
१८६	२०	व्यवधानोऽपि	व्यवधानेऽपि
२१६	२१	एतच्च	ततश्च
”	२२	विशेषं दर्शयति...ननु विशेषं	
२२६	२७	सम्बन्ध	सम्बद्ध
३११	१५	कन्निति	क्वन्निति
३२२	८, १२	समरणौ	शमरणौ
३५४	४	त्यवन्तः	त्यवन्तः
४०८	१८	नोपसर्गं	सोपसर्गं
”	२२	संहत	संहित
”	२६	एकोऽर्थो	एकोऽभिन्नोऽर्थो
५२८	२३	ङ्किति	क्ङिति
५३०	१८	ङ्किति	क्ङिति
५४०	१७ १८	”	”
५५६	२६	अवाप्युरिति	अवाप्सुरिति



# KASIKA VIVARANA PANJIKĀ

## Vol III

### शुद्धिपत्रम्

पृष्ठायाम्	पङ्क्तौ	अशुद्धम्	शुद्धम्
७२०	११	मम्माग	सन्माग
७४८	१६	तथाप्यते	तथाप्यात
७७३	८	बाधको	बाधकौ
"	२८	यौविशेष्ये त	यौ विशिष्ये ते
७७८	८	भावार्थे	भवार्थे
८१८	११	चिण् नलोप	चिण्णलो
८२४	२४	पृक्तन	पृक्त
८३१	१५	वा	वचनमाञ्चित्
८७१	७	विधायते	विधीयते
८८५	२५	प्रयोक्तु	प्रयोक्तुर्
८१६	१	कण्ण	कारणं
८३०	४	लडन्त ।	लडन्तम् ।
८४५	२५	षा	येषां
"	२६	पुत्रभाव	पुत्रभावः
"	"	यदपेक्ष	यदपेक्षं
८८५	२१	कुञ्चोति	कुञ्चेति
८८५	१८	दृष्ट	दृष्टः
१०००	२६	मच	मच
and "परत्तु न्यास ..गृहीत." is to go before "भाष्ये त्वयं..."			
१००३	२४	रकार	वकार
"	२६	गूरी	गुरी
१००४	२१	इट्	ईट्
१०३०	१७	दोधिक	दोधक
"	२०	स्वयम्	स्वयम्
१०८१	११	किप्रत्ययान्तः	किप्रत्ययान्ताः
११०६	२२	तदुत्तरमित्येष	तदुत्तरपदमित्येष
११२१	७	विधि	विधे
११२२	१०	ततेहा	तत्रेहा
"	१६	मचि	मचिं





II  
A BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE MSS

USED IN PREPARING THE PRESS COPY  
of the काशिकाविवरणपत्रिका ।

(1) The first MS (अ) contains I 4 (A), II 1 2 3, III I, VII 2 and VIII 1. It is owned by the Rajshahi Government College. For details see notes in P 332 and P 790 vol I.

(2) The second MS (ब) contains I 2 3 4 and II 1 2 3 4. Details are given in note P 332 vol I.

(3) The third MS (ग) is with only I 3 and II 4.

(4) The 4th MS (घ) containing I 2, III 1 2 and VI 1 4, At the end of 1-2 it has श्रीशुद्धशर्मणा लिखितम् । At the end of its 3-2 is श्रीकाशीपतिशर्मण पुस्तकनिदम् । लिखित श्रीजगन्नीह्नसेनेन । शकाब्दा १७३० आषाढस्य द्दतीपदिवसे । शक १७३० 1-1808 A D. Its pages were found torn in some places. But it is a correct copy. At the end of 6-4 is

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिचौशीशक सिद्धगते रवौ ।

व्यालिखि न्यासटीकेय श्रीकृष्णानन्दशर्मणा ॥१॥

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिचौशीशक is १७०१ that is 1779 A D. Elsewhere is शक १७३२ that is 1817 A D. See details in note P 790 vol I.

(5) The 5th MS (ङ) contains VII 1, 2, 3, 4 and VIII 1 2 3 4, For fuller account of this and of the MSS 11, 12, 20 and 21 vide pp 883-4 in vol II. It is an excellent, faithful and very correct MS got from Bengal. We have in the 5th MS VIII 2 though mutilated. This and the प्रत्याहार Section and 1 I are very rare in Bengal, and after much trouble we had been successful in procuring the Bengal recension of them.

(6) The Sixth MS (च) contains III 1.

(7) The 7th MS (ज) is with III 2. See note P 790, vol I.

(8) The 8th MS (झ) is with III, 4. See note P 790, vol I.

(9) The 9th MS (ख) It was from the Deccan College Poona, kindly lent by the late lamented Professor Ghate. It has प्रत्याहार, I 1 2 3 4, IV 1 2 3 4 and V 1 2 3 4. See page 331 and Page 1061 notes, vol I.

(10) The 10th MS (प) is with V 1 3. Its copyist and owner was one श्रीकान्तशर्मा ।

(11) The 11th MS (फ) containing II 1, 2, VI 3 and VII 1 2 3 4. It has at the end लिखिता श्रीरामकान्तशर्मणा । A very good and correct MS.

---

(A) 1-4 indicates the fourth pada (or section) of the 1st Adhyaya and similarly 2 1 or 2-1 is the 1st pada of the 2nd Adhyaya and so on.

(12) The 12th MS (क) has 1 3 II 1 2 3, IV 1 VII 1 2 3 4 and VIII 1 4 see note P 484

(13) The 13th MS (ख) is with प्रत्याहार, I 1 2 3 and II 1 2 3 4 see note 331 vol I This is the Bengal MS containing the प्रत्याहार and I 1 of the beginning of the न्यास । It is the property, and is now in the office, of the वैश्वेन्द्र society

(14) The 14th MS (ग) with VIII 3 is from the village शालिखा, Rajshahi It has at the end श्रीशिवरामशर्मा स्वच्छरम् । शकाब्दा १६४६ i.e 1724 A D

(15) The 15th MS (घ) is with VI 4

(16) The 16th MS (च) is with 1 4 see note p 332, vol I

(17) The 17th MS (छ) is from the Deccan College, Poona It contains II 1 2 3 4 See note P, 484 vol I

(18) The 18th MS (द) has VII 2 and VIII 4 vide note P 884 vol II

(19) The 19th MS (ब) has VII 3 4 vide note P 884 vol II

(20) The 20th MS (व) is with VII 1 2 3 and VIII 1 2 3 At the end of 7-1 is शुभमस्तु शकाब्दा १६६५ i.e 1773 A D At the end of VIII 1 is तिष्ठौ गोवादीनीति । अत्र शेषभागस्य दशनाभावान्न स लिखित । So it is incomplete Infact the Vedic portions of the Book were mostly lost in Bengal It was from other provinces of India that they were to be procured

(21) The 21st MS (ष) is with II 1, VII 1 4 and VIII 1 3

(22) The 22nd MS (भ) with III 3 and IV 2 It is a copy written in Devanagar, duly compared and certified, from the MS on the palm leaves in Canarese characters at the Sravan Belgolah Jain temple, Mysore It was got in 1915 See note P 791, vol 1

(23) The 23rd MS (ड) with VI 3 4 and VIII 3 4, was got from the village बद्यवेलावरिया, Rajshahi, from the house of पण्डित शिवचन्द्रसिद्धान्त ।

(24) The 24th MS is with III 3 See note P 791 vol I

(25) The 25th MS (स) is also a copy in Devanagar certified as duly compared with the original from the aforesaid Sravan Belgolah MS prepared like the copy of the MS XXII Its contents are VI 1 2 and VIII 1 2 But VI, 2 VIII 2 were incomplete

(26) The 26th MS (य) is with VI 2 This is a portion of the Kasmir MS and a copy in Devanagar, certified as duly compared It has been got from the Superintendent Research Department, Srinagar, Jamoo Kasmir State, Kasmir

(27) The 27th MS (र) contains VI 2, and VIII I 2 It has been procured from the Oriental Library Barada, Gacquare's State The MS in this Library also is not complete and contains only V, VI, VII and some portions of VIII It is in the Devanagar characters and were written in 1463 चवत् i.e 1406 A D I am indebted to Mr Benoytosh Bhattacharya M A Superintendent, of the aforesaid Library for photographed facsimiles of the portions of V 2 & VIII 1 & 2, while we were extremely in want of them

## APPENDIX

### I

After the printing of the VI 2, based mainly on the Kashmir MS had been finished, the photoed facsimiles of the Baroda MS of the same came to us. On comparison it is found that the latter contains some differently worded and some additional and some common statements in the Sutras 197 and 199 of VI 2 though all other Sutras of the section are identical in both. As the Kashmir MS given to us was a transcript and the Baroda one is a photoed facsimile, the original of which had been written so early as 1406 A. D. the latter seems to be the genuine thing. So the version as found in the Baroda MS regarding the Sutras 197 and 199 of VI 2 is printed below —

In the case of the remaining Sutras of the entire Nyasa the MSS from the different quarters have been found throughout as precisely identical excepting a few slight and occasional variants. All these variants have been noticed in due places.

### १६७ । द्वित्रिभ्यां पाददन्मूर्धसु बहुव्रीहौ ।

द्वित्रिभ्यामिति । दिग् योगलक्षणा (२।३।२६) पञ्चमौ । पाददन्मूर्धस्विति । यस्य च भावेन भावलक्षणमिति ( २।३।६७ ) भावलक्षणा सप्तमौ । द्विपात् त्रिपादिति । पादस्य लोपोऽहस्यादिभ्यः ( ५।४।१३८ ) । संख्यासुपूर्वस्येत्यकार-लोपः ( ५।४।१४० ) । पादशब्दो घञन्तत्वादाद्युदात्तइति पाचञ्चश्चाद्युदात्तएव भवति । द्विदन्निति । वयसि दन्तस्येति ( ५।४।१४१ ) दत्तादेशः । दन्तशब्द आद्युदात्त इत्युक्तम् । तेन दत्तादेशोऽपि स्थानिवद्भावेनाद्युदात्तएव भवति । द्विमूर्धेति । मूर्धशब्दः श्वन्नुच्चन्पूषन् व्रीहन्नित्यादिना रन्-(उण्, १।१५७ ) प्रत्ययान्तो निपात्यते । तेनाद्युदात्तः । मूर्धन्नित्यादि । द्वित्रिभ्या षो मूर्ध् इति ( ५।४।११५ ) षः समासान्त प्राप्नोति । स न क्ततः । तेनात्र नान्तएव मूर्धशब्दः । किं पुनः कारणमक्तसमासान्त एव मूर्धञ्शब्द उपात्त इत्यत आह तस्येत्यादि । यदि क्तसमासान्त उपादीयेत तदा सत्येव समासान्तोऽन्तोदात्तत्वं स्यात् । असति न स्यात् । तस्मादसत्यपि समासान्तोऽन्तोदात्तत्व यथा स्यादित्येतत् प्रयोजनमक्त-समासान्तनिर्देशस्य । ननु च नित्यमेव समासान्तेन भवितव्यम् । तत् कुतस्तस्या-सत्त्वमित्यत आह एतदेवेत्यादि । यदिदमस्य प्रयोजनस्य सम्पादनार्थमक्त-समासान्तस्य मूर्धञ् शब्दस्योपादानम् एतदेव ज्ञापकम् अनित्यः समासान्तो भवतीति । तेन द्विमूर्धेत्यादिप्रयोग उपपन्नो भवति । यदि तर्ह्यक्तसमासान्त इह मूर्धञ्शब्द उपात्त एव सति यदा समासान्तः क्रियते तदान्तोदात्तेन न भवितव्यम् । क्तसमासान्तस्य शब्दान्तरत्वादित्यत आह यद्यपीत्यादि । इह हि बहुव्रीहिः कायी । तदेकदेशित्वञ्च समासान्तस्य । एकदेशोऽस्यास्तीत्येकदेशो । स बहुव्रीहि

रिकदेशी यस्य समासान्तस्य स तदेकदेशी । तद्भावस्तदेकदेशित्वम् । एतेन बहुव्रीह्य-  
वयवत्वं समासान्तस्य दर्शयन् कृतसमासान्तस्य शब्दान्तरत्वं निरस्यति । तदेवं  
यस्मादिह बहुव्रीहिः कार्यो तदेकदेशित्वञ्च समासान्तस्य तस्माद् यदापि  
समासान्तं क्रियते तदापि पन्नेन्तोदात्तत्वं भवत्येव । कल्याणमूर्धति । कल्याण-  
शब्दो नबन्विषयस्येत्याद्युदात्तः ( फिट्, २६ ) । इयो मूर्धति । अत्र  
नित्यमेव समासान्तोदात्तत्वं भवति ।

### १६६ । परादिऋन्दसि बहुलम् ।

परशब्देनात्र सकथशब्दएव गृह्यतइति । प्रत्यासत्तेः । स हि पूर्वसूत्रे  
सन्निहितत्वात् प्रत्यासन्नः । यद्येवं परशब्दग्रहणमनर्थकम् । सकथशब्दएव  
ह्यत्रानुवर्त्तिष्यते । नैतदस्ति । बहुव्रीहिग्रहणमप्यत्रानुवर्त्ततइति तस्याप्याद्यु-  
दात्तत्वमाशङ्क्यते । अञ्चिमकथमिति । अञ्चिशब्दः प्रातिपदिकस्वरिणान्तोदात्तः ।  
अथाप्यञ्च शब्दान् मत्वर्थइनिः क्रियत एवमप्यन्तोदात्तएव । लोमशसकथमिति ।  
(A) लोमादिपामादिपिच्छादिभ्यः शनेलच इति ( ५ २।१०० ) शप्रत्ययान्त-  
त्वालोमशशब्दोऽन्तोदात्तः । ऋजुबाहुरिति ; कुभ्रश्चेत्यधिकृत्य ( उण्, १।२२ )  
अर्जिदशिकम्यमिपशिवाधामृजिपशितुग्धुग्दीघहकारश्चेति ( उण्, १।२७ )  
कुप्रत्ययान्तौ ऋजुबाहुशब्दौ । तेनान्तोदात्तौ । वाक्पतिश्चित्पतिरिति ।  
षष्ठीसमासावेती । अत्रोत्तरमाद्युदात्तं भवति । बहुलग्रहणात् । विभाषा-  
ग्रहणे हि प्रकृते बहुलग्रहणेन यत् सिध्यति तद्दर्शनार्थं सुपन्त्यस्तः । व्यत्ययो  
बहुलं ततइति । यत एव बहुलग्रहणेनानेन कार्ये सिध्यति तेन व्यत्ययो बहुलं  
भवति । ननु च पूर्वमेव स्वराणा व्यत्ययो विहितः । सत्यमेतत् । तस्यैव तु  
प्रपञ्चोऽयम् । परादि रुदाहृतइति । वाक्पतिश्चित्पतिरिति । अत्र च  
परग्रहणेनोत्तरपदमुक्तम् । अन्तोदात्तप्रकरणइति । अन्तः ( ६।२।१४३ ) ।  
याथघञ्क्ताजबित्रकाणामित्यादौ ( ६।२।६४४ ) । पूर्वपदान्तोदात्तप्रकरणइति ।  
अन्तः ( ६।२।६२ ) । सर्वं गुणकारत्स्नम् इत्यादौ ( ६।२।६३ ) । पूर्वपदाद्यु-  
दात्तप्रकरण इति । आदिरुदात्तः ( ६।२।६४ ) सप्तमोऽह्वरिणौ धर्म्येऽह्वरण इत्यादौ  
( ६।२।६३ ) । एवमादि मवं संगृहीतं भवतीति । बहुलग्रहणेन । यतस्तेन  
विभाषाग्रहणे प्रकृते बहुलग्रहनं कृतमित्यभिप्रायः । त्रिचक्रादोना पूर्वमेव  
पूर्वोत्तरपदस्वर उक्तइति पुनरिह नोच्यते ॥

इति षष्ठाध्यायस्य द्वितीयः पादः ॥२॥

(A) मुद्रितकाशिकायान्तु त्वाष्ट्री लोमसश्चाविति पाठ । न्यासकारस्तु लोमशसकथाविति पठति ।

# The काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

## INTRODUCTION.

शेषाशेषार्थविद् यो सा शेषाशेषगवीः स्फुटम ।

विशिष्याव्यापयद् वन्दे त श्रेयशयनीपमम ॥ १ ॥

Before entering into some accounts of Jinendra Buddhi, the main facts hitherto ascertained in connection with the chief grammarians of the Panini school, who had preceded that author, may be briefly noticed here. In absence of authentic details, they are no doubt often found full of confusion and unfit for yielding any sure conclusion. Yet the importance of the subject demands a review of them and hence this digression is made regarding those authors

### I पाणिनि ।

This ancient and great grammarian of India is known only by his aphorisms (Sutras). They form his work called the अष्टाध्यायी or the (पाणिनाय) ऋषक. He did not amplify these Sutras with any explanations or illustrations. As to the grammarians anterior to पाणिनि, the अष्टाध्यायी furnishes the names of ten sages ११८ आपिशलि, काश्यप, गाय, गालव, चाक्रवर्ची, भारद्वाज, शकल्य, जगदायन, सिकक and स्फोटायन, (1) Panini's age is a debatable matter. Scholars have assigned different periods to it. Some give 2400 B. C., some 900 B. C., some 650 B. C., some 550 B. C., and others 350 B. C. as his age. The कथामरित्सामर makes पाणिनि, कात्यायन and व्याडि all co-eval with the king Nanda of Magadha. But as a story book, it may not be true in its chronology. Raj shekhara's statement in his काव्यमीमांसा merely asserts that these sages were examined and put on test at Pataluputra and obtained fame. But it does not imply that they lived there at one and the same time or even assembled there ever simultaneously (2). So no reliance can be put on such statements as to their synchronisation.

The word वचन occurs in his sutra 4. 1. 49, लिपि in 3. 2. 21, सन् in 4. 1. 161 and वक्तु in (2. 4. 63). We find also in the अष्टाध्यायी the words अति, भृगु, कुतस,

---

(1) Though in the गणपाठ, दीप्तरसादि occurs in the तौल्लादि (२।४।६१), कामकृतक in the उपकादि (२।४।१९), दाक्षायण in the ऐषुकायादि (४।२।५४) and व्याडि is in the क्रौड्यादि (४।१।८०) गद्गादि (४।२।६६), and कात्यायिदिशण (६।२।४८), they cannot be taken as coming from Panini himself. The गणपाठ was not the work of a single author. It was subsequently enlarged by others.

(2) "श्रूयते च पाटलिपुत्रे शास्त्रकारपरीक्षा ।

अक्षोपवर्षवर्षाविह्व पाणिनिपिङ्गलाविह्व व्याडिः ।

वरकचिपतञ्जली इह परीक्षिताः स्वयत्सुपत्रम् ॥" इति काव्यमीमांसायाम् ।

वसिष्ठ, गीतम, अङ्गिरस् (2 4 65) आगन्ता, कोण्डिन्य (2 4 70) कद्रु (4 1.71) श्रेण, अश्वक, वृषि, कुक, सोवीर, वासुदेव, अर्जुन, भारत (6 2 38), इच्छाकु (6 8 178) सिबद्यु, गान्धारि and such others and some geographical terms such as उशीर, गौड (6 2 100), वाहीक, विगर्ष, मगध, सुरमध, कलिङ्ग, कोशल, आजाद, साल, अग्रमक, कम्बोज, अवन्ति, कुन्ति, विपाश्, सुवास्त, कापिश्री, काशी, मद्र, वजि, युगम्बर, कच्छ, विदूर, सिन्धु, तक्षशिला, वृदी, शलातुर, वर्मती, कूषवाग, सरथू (6 8 178), केकय, चर्मण्वी, चामराट, &c as well, in addition to such aphorisms as सङ्खलादिभ्यश्च (4 2 75), परश्चादिवीषेयादिभ्योऽणञौ (5 3 117), &c These are taken as good hints for determining his time. (3)

The aphorisms कुमारः श्रमणादिभिः (१।१७०), पाराशर्यशिलालिभ्या भिन्ननटस्त्वयोः (४।१।११०) कमन्दकशास्त्रादिभिः (४।१।११), मस्करमस्करिणौ वेणुपरिज्जाजयोः (४।१।५३), निर्वाणोऽवाते (८.२।५०) &c indicate that there had existed at the time when the Grammarian lived, or before him, some other religion or religions side by side with Brahminism. This is clear enough from the meanings which are assigned by the भाष्यकार. to the words श्रमण and मस्करिण ।

There is no doubt that Sanskrit was a colloquial language of the people of Northern India (आर्यावर्त) for some centuries in ancient time. It ceased to be so, probably some two hundred years after patanjali's date. Though thus dead, it remained still long enough as the exclusive property of the Brahmins. The Buddhist, always jealous of it, began at first to adopt a sort of broken Sanskrit and ultimately made Pali their chief tongue. Patanjali, in the second century B C, testified that Sanskrit was a current language spoken even by ordinary people. He speaks of a charioteer, certainly not a Brahmin, correcting the derivation of a Sanskrit word misinterpreted by a student of Grammar (भाष्य 2 4 6). Again in the भाष्य of 8 2 83, we find a man jeering another in Sanskrit (4) Nay, long before the भाष्यकार, Sanskrit had been also a

(3) Dr S K Belvalkar, Professor, Deccan College, Poona, says "Here the *Parsus* or the Persians and the *Asuras* or the Assyrians are mentioned as an आयुधजौविसद्य or an organisation of mercenary fighters similar to the Greeks of the 4th century B C or the Germans of the 17th century. The Persians were blotted out as a political power in B C 329 and the Assyrians in 538 B C" (Systems of Sanskrit Grammar). The city साङ्गल, Gr Sangal, was totally destroyed by Alexander in 326 B C.

(4) (1) एष हि कश्चिद् वैद्याकरण आह "कोऽस्य रथस्य प्रवेतेति" । सूत आह "अहमायुधमन्नस्य रथस्य प्राजितेति" । वैद्याकरण आह "अपशब्द इति ।" सूत आह "प्रासिञ्जी देवानामिष" । न लिपिञ्ज । इयत् एतद्रूपमिति" । वैद्याकरण आह "अहो खल्वनेन दुरुतेन बाव्यामह इति" । सूत आह "न खलु वैचा सूत । सुवतेरेव सूत । यदि सुवते कुत्सा प्रयीक्तव्या दुसुतेनेति वक्तव्यम् ।" (भाष्य (2 4 56) (ii) "स्थालो अह भोः ।" "आयुषानेधि स्थालि"न् । "नैषा मम सजा स्थालीति" । "किं तर्हि" ? "दृष्टिन्यायो मम विवक्षित । स वक्तव्य । स्थालो अह भोः ।" "आयुषानेधि स्थालिन् ।" "न मम दृष्टिन्यायो विवक्षित ।" "किं तर्हि ?" "सजा ममैवा ।" "असूयकस्त्वमसि जाय । न त्व प्रथमिवादन महैसि । भिदास्व वृषल । स्थालिन् ।"—(भाष्य, 8 2. 83) दृष्टिन्याय alludes to the etymological meaning of the word दृष्टिन् ।<sup>e</sup> असूयक, दृष्टाऽस्यस्येति । So

*language of conversation* Otherwise Panini would not have taken so much care to prepare hundreds of Sutas on accents of words, with extreme nicety and sharp minuteness Consider the Suta उदक् च विपाञ्ज ( 4 2 73 ) It regulates the derivation of such words as दात्त, गौत, &c with affixes अञ् and अण्, without altering the sense, for different accents in them They were pronounced in one way by the people living in the north bank of the river विपाञ्ज (Beas) and in a different way by those who lived on its Southern bank Struck with such keen knowledge and nice discrimination of the sage, जयादित्य the author of the Kasikavritti, speaks out in his praise महती सूत्रचिका वर्तते सूत्रकारस्य ( काशिका, 4 2 74 ) Such care and exertions to preserve the purity of a language must have been taken when it was in its balmy days of glory and in the full vigour of its colloquial state It could not be at a time when Pali was slowly and gradually setting aside Sanskrit

The Suta भियोद्भौ नदे ( 3 1 115 ) presents the names of two rivers It is wholly obscure where and when these rivers existed How and when they were defunct are also mysterious They had certainly existed once There is no reason why the grammarian should falsely or uselessly give us a Suta, referring to two never existing rivers The terminologist cannot be supposed either crazy or sportive to issue such things merely from his imagination So the disappearance of the rivers भिय and उद्भौ at a time somehow immemorial, may stand against the view which alleges पाणिनि as flourishing so late as the fourth century B C Considering all these and the references cited above from his Sutas, and taking व्याडि as the author of the सयह and prior to कात्यायन because of his naming the former in the Vartikas, we differ from the great scholars who take the Grammarian as a man of about the time of Nanda the king of Magadha We think him as flourishing at least half a century earlier than 500 B C

The Grammarian shows his marvellous acquaintance with ancient manners and customs of the people of several countries The term कौशिय comes from the Suta कौशाड ढक् ( 4 3 42 ) and means a sort of silk cloth It was a production of industry which is said to have been current only in China in time sufficiently old (5) Here पाणिनि supplies a very early information regarding cocoon Consider again the Suta मनुष्यतत्स्थयोर्वुञ् ( 4 2 134 ).

---

स्थानिन् means स्थानमस्त्वस्थिति । If स्थानिन् be a सत्त्वा । e the name of a person, its last vowel is to be pronounced as prolated ( षुत ) in re address ( प्रत्यभिवादन ) But in its derivative ( यौगिक ) sense, its last vowel shall not be षुत ।

(5) कौशिय क्कामिकौशित्थमित्यमरः । “कौशे सभूत कौशिय वस्त्रम् । रुदिरिषा । तेन क्किसौ न भवति । रत्नकौशाद्येति” काशिका । निर्नामिकौशियमुपासवाणमिति कालिदासः । As such silk used to come from China, it was often called चीनायक । We have in कालिदास,—“चीनायकमिव केतो प्रतिवात नीयमानस्य”, again “चीनायकं कल्पितकेतुमालम् ।’



By this, such forms as काच्छक, सैन्धवक, वार्णवक, काश्मीरक, कौलूतक & are formed from terms काच्छ, सिन्धु, वर्ण, काश्मीर, कुलूत, & which indicate countries and the derivative words imply the residents of those countries as well as their manners and customs, e g काच्छकी मनुष्य । काच्छकमस्य हसित जल्पितम् । काच्छिका चूडा । सैन्धवको मनुष्यः । सैन्धवकमस्य हसित जल्पितम् । सैन्धविका चूडा and so on Take another, सजायां कन्योशीनरेषु ( 2 4 20) A kind of कन्या (quilt) used in the country of उशीनर acquired a technical sense on account of some peculiarities in it It was to be in neutre when at the end of some compound words The sage had observed this and bearing it in mind recorded the fact in his Sutra His acquaintance with and repeated reference to such matters of Western India leads one to think of him as a native of that part of the country The व्यासकार and others called him शलातुरीय connected with the country शलातुर which was in the modern district of Peshwar in the N W Frontier province of British India Panini's ancestors lived there The Chinese pilgrim Hiuén Thsang even speaks of शलातुर as the birthplace, and also of a statue having been erected there, of the Grammarian But the Indian Scholars derive शलातुरीय in connection with his अभिजन (the residence of his ancestors) and not in connection with his birth place or निवास (ie his own residence) शलातुरी नाम ग्राम । सोऽभिजनोऽस्याद्वीति शलातुरीयः पाणिनिः ।

The sage is called दाक्षीपुत्र and so his mother was a दाक्षी । दक्ष is therefore one of his maternal ancestors There had been one पणिन् among his paternal forefathers The grandson or any subsequent successor of पणिन् was पाणिन । पाणिनि was either the great-grandson or any later progeny of this पाणिन । This is found from the etymology of the word पाणिनि as it is derived with the affix इञ् applied to the term पाणिन, in the grammatical sense of युवन् ।

There is a statement in the पञ्चतन्त्र—“सिद्धो व्याकरणस्य कर्तुरहरत प्राणान् प्रियान् पाणिने” and it may or many not be true There are 3996 Sutras in all in the अष्टाध्यायी ।

“वीणिं सूत्रमहस्ताणि तथा नव शतानि च ।

षष्ठदतिष्ठ सुवाया पाणिनि कृतवान् स्वयम् ॥ १ ॥

By the end of the 8th century A D a Sanskrit Poem named the जाम्बवती-जयकाव्य or the जाम्बवतीविजयकाव्य was composed by a writer who was clever enough in palming his book off under the name of पाणिनि It was राजशेखर the dramatist, preceptor to महिन्द्रपाल king of Kanauj (AD 890—910 AD), who seems to have given much prominence to an assertion that Panini had been the author of this काव्य Hence probably much value was set on and some undue regard paid to it, by a few classical authors such as शरणादेव, पुत्रोत्तम, &c The sage could, in fact, have no connexion with this book which was undoubtedly a later Production

(2) व्याडि ।

No grammarian is heard of in the interval between पाणिनि and कात्यायन, if व्याडि be not such a one कात्यायन cites the authority of व्याडि in a वार्तिक of his attached to १ २ ६४ वृत् इत्याभिधान व्याडि— which is explained by पतञ्जलि as इत्याभिधान व्याडिराचार्यो न्याय्य सन्ति । To the Sutra आचार्योपसर्जनयान्नेवासी (६२.३६), पतञ्जलि cites the illustration आपिशलपाणिनीयव्याडीयगौतमीयाः । कुषि and चृषि are named as prior to पतञ्जलि । But how they are connected with कात्यायन in time is not known भर्तृहरि says in his वाक्यपदीय (6) that there was a grammatical work called सग्रह । When it was obsolete, पतञ्जलि prepared his Great Commentary—the महाभाष्य—which was the सग्रहप्रतिकञ्चक, that is, the substance or essence of the सग्रह । But the महाभाष्य deals chiefly with the Vartikas by कात्यायन and the सग्रह had probably to do nothing with them So the महाभाष्य is called the सग्रहप्रतिकञ्चक, probably because it had adopted and incorporated the grammatical tenets and principles set down in the सग्रह । व्याडि is also supposed to have collected together all परिभाषा or the Sutras of the antepanini grammarians, which have been tacitly adopted as authoritative by the commentators and the followers of the अष्टाध्यायी ।

पतञ्जलि names one दाक्षायण as the author of the सग्रह । To illustrate the Sutra २ ३ २६, he says—“श्रीभना खलु दाक्षायणस्य सग्रहस्य कृतिः । श्रीभना खलु दाक्षायणस्य सग्रहस्य कृतिः ।” In ४ २ ६०, he puts वार्तिकसत्त्विक (7) सग्रहसत्त्विक, सवार्तिकः, समग्रहः । In the पस्यशा ( or the commencing chapter of the महाभाष्य ) is the passage सग्रह एतत् प्राधान्येन परीक्षितम् and again सग्रहे तावत् कार्यप्रतिबन्धिभावान् सत्यासहे नित्यपथायवार्तिकी गृह्यन्मिति । Besides, he leads us to a fact that the author of the सग्रह was a kinsman to Panini In the भाष्य of १ २ २० and again of VII १ २७ stands the Stanza—

सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीपुत्रस्य पाणिनेः ।

एकदेशविकारे तु नित्यत्वमुपजायते ॥ १ ॥

from which Panini's mother is found to be a दाक्षी, a relation to दक्ष । दाक्षी is derived from दाक्षि by डष् under इती सनुष्यजति, (4 १ ९५) दाक्षि again comes from दक्ष by the patronymic डष् (4 १ ९५) So दाक्षि is a descendant of दक्ष and coeval with दाक्षी Now दाक्षायण is a युवा descendant of दाक्षि by यजिजोय (4 १ १०१) In Sanskrit grammar, a युवा descendant is either a great grandson or any of his

(6) प्रायेण सन्निपरुचो नन्वविद्यापरिग्रहान् । सप्राप्य वैद्याकरणाम् संग्रहेऽरुसुपागते ॥ १

कृतेऽथ पतञ्जलिना गुरुणा तीर्थदर्शना । सर्वेषां न्यायवीजानां महाभाष्ये निबन्धने ॥ २ ॥

अलङ्काराद्ये गान्धर्वीध्यादुत्तान इव सौष्ठवात् । तस्मिन्नङ्गतबुद्धीनां वैवावस्थित निश्चय ॥ ३ ॥

वैजिसौभवं ह्यर्थैश्चैश्चकतकार्मुसारिभिः । आर्षे विप्रवित्ते यथ्यं सग्रहप्रतिकञ्चके ॥ ४ ॥

य पतञ्जलिशिष्य भ्यो ऋती न्याकरणामस । कानि स दाक्षिणाण्डेषु गम्यामत्र व्यवस्थित ॥ ५ ॥

( वाक्यपदीय द्वितीयकाण्ड, श्लोक ४८४ ४८८ )

(7) Another reading here is वार्त्तिकसत्त्विक from the base वृत्सत्त्व ।

ndants So a दाक्षायण cannot but be at least *three* generations later than दाक्षि । Thus the distance in time between दाक्षीपुत्र (or पाणिनि) and दाक्षायण can not be less than at least two generations

Now पुण्यराज (8) a commentator of the वाक्यपदीय asserts, in explaining the stanzas प्रायेण सक्षेपरुचीन् &c quoted above, that “इह पुरा पाणिनीयेऽस्मिन् व्याकरणे व्याख्य-परचितं ग्रन्थलक्षपरिमाणं सग्रहाभिधानं निबन्धनमासीत् । तत्र काखवशात् सुक्तमारुङ्गीन् वैयाकरणान् प्राप्यास्तनुपागतम् ।” So, if व्याडि be the author of the सग्रह, he is a दाक्षायण ।

The सग्रह is also mentioned in the काशिका in 4 2 60 viz —साग्रहस्त्विकः and संसंग्रह and again in VII 3 76 ससग्रह व्याकरणमधीयते । In 2 4 21 and in 6 2 14 is व्याख्युपन्न दुष्करणम् । श्रीपतिदत्त the writer of the कातन्त्रपरिशिष्ट, who had flourished in the 13th century A D also refers to the सग्रह and remarks सग्रहकारोऽप्याह &c

As to the inclusion of व्याडि in the ह्याद्यादि (6 2 48) गहादि (4 2 66) and क्रोड्यादि (4 1 80) गण, it is to be noticed that the groups of words originally fixed, had been augmented with later additions to them by other grammarians This probably led जिनेन्द्रद्वि to observe in VII 4 3 प्रतिपादितं हि पूव गणकार पाणिनि न भव-सूति । तथा चान्यो हि गणकार । अन्यो हि स्वकार ।” Says also कैयट I 1 34, ‘अभि-युक्ता गणान् पठन् . . . । व्यदादीनि पठित्वा ( सवाटि ) गणे कैश्चित् पूर्वादीनि पठितानि ।’

Besides, व्याडि being a descendant of व्यड given in the स्वागतादिगण (7 3 7), may as well be any member of the family other than the author of the सग्रह Taking व्याडि as the author of the सग्रह and as referred to by कात्यायन in his वार्तिक as stated above, he might be living in 450 B C

### (3) कात्यायन ।

According to the ऋषासर्तिसागर, कात्यायन was a contemporary to the king Nanda of Magadha, by ousting whom the मौर्य king चन्द्रगुप्त set up his own reign there in about 321 B C कात्यायन wrote a critique on the अष्टाध्यायी, containing short epigramatic statements called the Vartikas He often assigned new meanings to words cited by पाणिनि in different senses and advocated such alterations by his Vartikas such as यवनाल्लिप्याम् (4 1 4) पथ्यव्यायन्यायविहारमनुष्य हस्तिषु (4 2 129), &c So the interval between पाणिनि and कात्यायन was long enough Otherwise such changes in a language cannot be so rapid He lived probably in 350, B C That कात्यायन was not a contemporary of Panini appears to be almost certain Our attention is arrested by his veneration for the sage This is evident from such of his Vartikas as ऋषिशासिगुणेन च यत् सचते तदक्रीर्णित साचरित कविना ( 1 4 51 वार्तिक ), तदनल्पमतेर्वचनं चरत ( 1 4 51 तृतीय वार्तिक ), अरन्ति कर्तुर्वचनान् मनीषिणः ( 6 4 110, वार्तिक ) च भगवान् कृतवासादर्थं तेन भवेदिति ये

(8) पुण्यराज finishes his commentary with शशाङ्गशिष्याङ्गुलैतद् वाक्यकार्खं समासत् । पुण्यराजेन तस्योक्ता सङ्गति कारिकाश्रिता ॥ १ ॥ गुरवे भर्तृहरये शब्दरत्नविदे नमः । सर्वसिद्धान्त सन्दीहसागण्डतमयाय च ॥ २ ॥ So some चाण्ड grammarian helped him in preparing his book If भर्तृहरि were really his preceptor, he lived in the 7th century A D

विनिवृत्ति' ( ६।४।२२, वार्तिक ) , भगवत पाणिनेः सिद्धम् ( ८।४।६८, वार्तिक ) । In these statements कात्यायन mentions पाणिनि as कवि ( poet or of retentive memory, मेधावी ), अत्यन्तमति ( i e of much intelligence, wise ), कर्ता ( master ) भगवान् ( sage ) Here the term भगवान् at least is too high and respectful This clearly shows Panini's priority to Katyayana. Otherwise is it not unusual and strange to apply भगवान् or such an appellation of respect to a rival who is a contemporary or a neighbour ? They may be applied, if applied at all by coeval persons, at most to a very old personage of established fame and of some extraordinary power or ability Besides the words स्मरन्ति and स्मरत in two of those above quoted Vartikas are, I think, enough to shake out such a likelihood in the present case Says कात्यायन, तदनन्तमे वचन स्मरत Recollect the word of that wise man. Again he says स्मरन्ति कर्तव्यवान् पाणिनेः i e the intelligent remember on account of the word of the master Remembering surely cannot but relate to something which had been once very well known and now disappeared from memory, This, I think, strongly decides the earlier existence of पाणिनि and Katyayana's posteriority

कात्यायन names व्याडि, वाजप्यायन and पौष्करसादि in his vartikas So they could not be posterior to him He was a resident of the Deccan पतञ्जलि taunted him with the remark प्रियतद्विता दाक्षिणात्या, that is, the people of the Deccan are fond of the तद्धित affixes The occasion for this taunt was that instead of stating लोके वेदे च, कात्यायन had used लोकिकवैदिकेषु in the वार्तिक—“अनुकरणं शिष्टाश्रितप्रतिविद्धेषु यथा लोकिकवैदिकेषु । Yet he honoured कात्यायन elsewhere by calling him भगवान् कात्य —

“प्रोवाच भगवान् कात्य स्नेनासिद्धिर्येषु ते ।

आत को लिट् नैड पूर्व सिद्ध आहस्तया सति ॥ १ ॥” ( भाष्य ३ २ ३ )

Tradition gives another name to कात्यायन It is वररुचि The illustration वाररुच काव्यम् in the भाष्य of ४ ३ १०३ also refers to a वररुचि But it is uncertain if the grammarian कात्यायन is identical with the poet वररुचि Nor is it acknowledged by all that the वार्तिककार is the same personage who is the author of either any one or more of the following viz, अनुक्तसणिका, प्रातिशाखा, संहिता or other such works connected with the name of कात्यायन ।

Many vartikas are in poetry Only a few of them are assigned to कात्यायन and recorded in the वार्तिकपाठ । जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि, कैयट and नागोजिभट्ट often speak of some श्लोकवार्तिककार other than कात्यायन In the भाष्यप्रदीप of २ ४ ३६, कैयट speaks of one व्याघ्रभृति to whom is ascribed the श्लोकवार्तिक—

जगन्निविधिर्ल्यपि यत तदकस्मादसिद्धिमदस्ति कितीति विधानात् ।

ह्रिप्रभृतीस्तु सदा बहिरङ्गो ल्यब् भवतीति कृत तदु विद्धि ॥ १ ॥

As this stanza is quoted in the महाभाष्य ( २ ४ ३६ ) व्याघ्रभृति is found to be prior to पतञ्जलि The अनिट्-कारिकाs, eleven in number, enumerating ( ९ ) the अनिट्-

roots, also belong to व्याघ्रभूति There is another श्लोकवार्तिक quoted in 8 2 1 in the काशिका Viz —

युष्मिका युष्मजडा च चाभिमानौजडत तथा ।  
मतो बले भङ्गा जश्ल युडलिष्मान् निदर्शनम् ॥ १ ॥

which is known as composed by one व्याघ्रपात् । It is therefore called the वैयाघ्रप्रथमवार्तिक ।

#### (4) कुण्डि ।

We find the name of this grammarian in the भाष्यप्रदीप by कैयट and in the पदमञ्जरी by हरदत्तनिम्ब । From their reference, it is found that कुण्डि was prior to पतञ्जलि, for कैयट observes that पतञ्जलि adopted, in the महाभाष्य, Kuni's explanation of I 1 75 “कुण्डिना प्राग्यह्वण साचार्यनिर्देशार्थं व्यवस्थितविभाषार्थञ्चेति व्याख्यातम् । अन्येन तु प्राग्यह्वणं देशविशेषण व्याख्यातम् । भाष्यकारस्तु कुण्डिदर्शनमाश्रियत ।”—(कैयट १।१।७५ ) । In annotating on the काशिका stanza इत्थौ भाष्ये तथा धातुनामपारायणादिषु &c says हरदत्त—“स्वार्थप्रधानो ग्रन्थो इति । सा चेह पाणिनिप्रणीतानां स्वाया कुण्डिप्रभृतिभि राचाव्यविरचित विवरणम् ।” Probability is strong enough that कुण्डि and चूर्णितो be spoken of presently, are identical

#### (5) चूर्णित ।

The काशिका begins with इत्थौ भाष्ये तथा धातुनामपारायणादिषु The term इति here precedes the word भाष्य, from which the existence of an earlier work of that name on पाणिनि than the महाभाष्य, is inferred The सग्रह was one such, as also was the कुण्डिइति । जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि in explaining the verse says—“इतिः पाणिनिप्रणीतानां स्वायां विवरणं चूर्णितमिच्छादिविरचितम् । This reading is from the Poona Deccan college MS The MS in Bengali characters, which is in the Varendra Research Society of Rajshahi, Bengal, has—इति पाणिनिप्रणीतानां स्वायां विवरणं चूर्णितमिच्छादिविरचितम् ।” नैनेयरचित in his तन्त्रप्रदीप writes on 8 3 97—“सव्येष्टा इति । सारथिवचनोऽयम् । अत्र चूर्णितमिच्छादिविरचितं तत्पुरुषे इति बहुलमित्यलुग्ं दृश्यते ।” श्रीपतिदत्त of the कातन्त्रपरिशिष्ट speaks of the निर्लूरइति, Commenting on the चर्करीत roots, says he,—“निर्लूरइत्थौ चोक्त भाषायामपि यञ्जुमस्तीति So the न्यासकार seems to refer to two works चूर्णितमिच्छादिविरचितं and नञ्जुमस्तीति or निर्लूरइति This may induce one to think चूर्णितं and चूर्णितं of चूर्णितमिच्छादिविरचितं as the same It will presently be stated that the work by चूर्णितं was commented on by भर्तृहरि and चूर्णितमिच्छादिविरचितं might be this joint work

Regarding चूर्णितं, a very powerful evidence comes from the Chinese source Itsing, the Chinese traveller, who had been in India nineteen years from 671 A D to 691 A D refers to चूर्णितं Says he—“Next there is a commentary on the इतिस्त्व (10) entitled *Churni* It is a work of the learned पतञ्जलि This

(10) What was this इतिस्त्व ? Was it another commentary on the अष्टाध्यायी ? Who then was its author ? That the name इतिस्त्व for a grammatical book was recognised even in ancient time, is found from the variant चार्चित्तुविक for चार्चित्तुविक in the महाभाष्य in 4 2 60

again cites the former Sūtras (Panini's) explaining the obscure points and analysing the principles contained in it and it illustrates the latter commentary (the Vṛtti, that is, the काशिकावृत्ति) clearing up many difficulties. Advanced scholars learn it in three years". "Next there is the भर्तृहरिशास्त्र. This is the commentary of the foregoing चूर्णि and is the work of a great scholar भर्तृहरि।" (11)

चूर्णि is referred to by श्रीपतिदत्त. In his एतदप्रकरणे is the statement "मत्सेतव् चूर्णि-रप्यनुगृह्णाति and again "सयोगावयवव्यञ्जनस्य सजातीयस्यैकस्वैवानेकम्योच्चारणाभेदे इति चूर्णिः।" जगदीशभट्टाचार्य of the शब्दशक्तिप्रकाशिका and some other modern writers too speak of a grammatical scholiast चूर्णि। चूर्णि means something powdered. So the scholium is the चूर्णि. Hence its author is variously called चूर्णि, चूर्णिज्ञत or चूर्णिकार. According to Itsing, पतञ्जलि himself is this चूर्णि or चूर्णिज्ञत. Some Indians too hold this view. Now the work by चूर्णि and its commentary by भर्तृहरि narrated by Itsing, might be the चूर्णिभट्टिवृत्ति intanced by the न्यासकार and the latter was composed earlier than the काशिका. On the other hand if चूर्णि had really been a scholiast other than पतञ्जलि, he might be identical with कुण्डल mentioned by केशव and हरदत्त।

Now one thing is to be marked. If पतञ्जलि were the author of the चूर्णि, that is, of a scholium on पाणिनि, it was different from the महाभाष्य. For the महाभाष्य deals with the Vartikas by कात्यायन and not with Panini's aphorisms directly and generally. Hence that Scholium is no longer extant. कुण्डलवृत्ति (or चूर्णि वृत्ति) too is now defunct. There is however much confusion about चूर्णि. No satisfactory proofs are available at present to come to a decisive conclusion on the point. Further information is absolutely required to clear the obscurity.

#### (6) पतञ्जलि।

The Great Commentary, that is the महाभाष्य, is a work by पतञ्जलि। He defends Panini in it from the ill conceived and often erroneous attacks by कात्यायन, preferred in his Vartikas. To a वार्तिक, (त्रितपर्व्यायवचनस्यैव राजावयवम्) in I 1 68, पतञ्जलि puts two illustrations पुष्य (ष्य) मित्रसभा। चन्द्रगुप्तसभा। Now चन्द्रगुप्त founded the मौर्य dynasty of Magadha in about 321 B. C. Another चन्द्रगुप्त the first of the Gupta dynasty, was living in 320 A. D. It will be found presently that this second चन्द्रगुप्त could not have been intended by पतञ्जलि in supplying the name of a king in the illustration of the aforesaid वार्तिक। पुष्यमित्र (or पुष्यमित्र) was the founder of the Sunga dynasty in Magadha. He usurped the throne in about 183 B. C. by assassinating बृहद्रथ the last मौर्य king whose commander-in-chief he had been. पतञ्जलि again cites the name of पुष्य (ष्य) मित्र in the भाष्य of

---

(11) A record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and Maloy Archipelago (A. D. 671 to A. D. 695) by Itsing Translated by J. Takakusu B. A. Ph. D. Clarendon press, Oxford, 1856

III 1 26, पुष्पमित्रो यजते याजका याजयन्तीति । तत्र भवितव्यं पुष्पमित्रो याजयते याजका याजयन्तीति and again of III 11 123 “इह पुष्य (ष्य) मित्रं याजयाम ।” It is known from the Drama नाट्यविक्रान्तिमित्र by कालिदास that this king performed the अश्वमेध ceremony in which he appointed his grandson वसुमित्र to protect the sacred horse. Most likely पतञ्जलि witnessed this ceremony. Nay, remembering his statement इह पुष्पमित्रं याजयाम, it may be that he officiated in it as a priest. This king died in about 148 B C and was succeeded by his son अग्निमित्र । The illustrations अरुणदृ यवनं साकेतम् । अरुणदृ यवनी माध्यमिकाम् given for the वार्तिक in the Sutra III 11 111, determine his age from the three conditions laid down in it, viz —परोक्षे च लोकविज्ञाते प्रयोक्तृदर्शनविषये । Menander, called by the Buddhists Mihnda, a relation to the Bactrian king Eucratides and himself of Greek origin, was a king of the Punjab and Kabul. He besieged साकेत (Oude) and माध्यमिका in 155 B C. माध्यमिका here indicates a country. It is Nagari, near Chitore in Rajputana. It is also mentioned in the बृहत्संहिता,—“मरुत्सघोषयामुनसार-स्वतसाध्यमिका” (14/2). Now the प्रयोक्ता (speaker) of those two illustrations is पतञ्जलि himself. The event was notorious enough (लोकविज्ञात) It was out of his sight, though capable of being viewed by him (12). Hence पतञ्जलि was living in 155 B C.

The statement “मौख्यैर्हिरण्यार्थिभिरर्थाः प्रकल्पिता । भवेत् । तासु न स्यात् ।” in the भाष्य of V 111 99, may also indicate, if the passage be not corrupted in transcription or transmission, the impecunious conditions of the last सौर्य kings and their kinsmen who had flourished before पतञ्जलि । The example जालुका, श्लोका in the भाष्य of IV 111 101, refers probably to a very remote period, as we know from the राजतरङ्गिणी that one जालुक had been a king of काश्मीर in about 600 B C. The statement एकाकिमि बुद्धकैर्जितम् occurs in the भाष्य of 1 1 31 and of 5 3 52. The बुद्धक people were defeated by Alexander the Great, but he could not annihilate them.

पतञ्जलि names in the महाभाष्य other authors such as दाक्षायण, गौनर्दाय, गोषिकापुत्र, वार्षाचरिण, काशकृतस्त्र, कुणरवाडव, and सौर्यभगवान् (13). Different schools of Grammarians or Scholars, such as भारद्वाजीयाः, क्रौड्डीयाः, सौनागा, and साल्मुयिराणायनीयाः, are also mentioned by him. In the भाष्य of III 11 108, he supplies the illustration उपसेदिवान् कौत्सः पाणिनिम् । This shows that कौत्स was rather some personage of the time. Otherwise why his approach to the great Grammarian,

(12) In imitation, in the चन्द्रव्याकरण, चन्द्रगोमौ puts the illustration अनयद् गुप्तो ह्यणामिति for his Sutra based upon the वार्तिकं परोक्षे च लोकविज्ञाते प्रयोक्तृदर्शनविषये (3 2 111). This refers, it is said, to Skanda Gupta's conquest over the Huns in 465 A D. If so चन्द्राचार्य्य lived likely in 465 A D. But others assert that चन्द्र was a contemporary to अभिसम्यु who reigned over काश्मीर in the first Century B C.

(13) सौर्य्ये the name of a city and a certain *Savant* (आचार्य्य) of it, is called सौर्य्यभगवान् by पतञ्जलि ।

should be so recorded? In 3 3 3 is वैयाकरणानाञ्च शाकटायन आह धातुज नासति । Again in 3 2 15 is वैयाकरणानां शाकटायनो रथसार्गे आसीन शकटसार्थं यान् नोपलभे ।

We find the statement “उभयथा गोणिकापुत्र” in the भाष्य of I 1 15, नागोजिभट्ट takes गोणिका as the name of Patanjali's mother गोनर्दीय occurs repeatedly viz — in the भाष्य of I 12, of I 1 29, of II 1 92 of III 1 92 and again of VII 2 101 The country गोनर्दी identified with the modern Gonda in Oude, belonged to the ‘Eastern Province’ known as such by the Grammarians of the time (14) and therefore जयादित्य forms an illustration with it as गोनर्दीय for I 1 75 which he understood to concern the प्राग्देश, or the “Eastern Province”

Now in the भाष्य of I 1 21, stands the passage गोनर्दीयस्त्वाह सत्यमेतत् सति लन्वस्मिन्निति and कैयट paraphrases it भाष्यकारस्त्वाह सति लन्वस्मिन्निति । Again in the भाष्य of I 1 29 is गोनर्दीय स्त्वाह अकच्छरी तु कच्छरौ प्रथङ् सुक्तसम्भौ । लक्षत्पिठक मक्षत्पिठक इत्येव भवितव्यमिति । On this says कैयट—“गोनर्दीयस्त्वाहिति । सुवप्रत्याख्यानमेतत् । यद्योचर हि मुनिवयस्य प्रामाण्यम् ।” So कैयट takes पतञ्जलि and गोनर्दीय as one and the same person

But in the कामसूत्र by वात्स्यायन, गोनर्दीय and गोणिकापुत्र are separately named as two persons and as certain authorities holding different views on a matter Now it is said that वात्स्यायन, कौटिल्य, चाणक्य, मल्लनाग and विश्वगुप्त (15) are the several names of one and the same person Hence if वात्स्यायन were the preceptor of चन्द्रगुप्त the मौल्य, गोनर्दीय or गोणिकापुत्र cannot be identical with पतञ्जलि । So, to support कैयट and नागोजि, गोनर्दीय and गोणिकापुत्र of the कामसूत्र are taken to be as some other authors.

The tradition is that the महाभाष्य became for some time obsolete It was the king अभिमन्यु of काशी, who brought, during the first century B C, the scholars from other provinces and set up its study in his own kingdom

देशान्तरादागमस्य व्याचक्षणात् क्षमापतिः ।

प्रावर्तयत विच्छिन्न महाभाष्य स्वमण्डले ॥ १ ॥ ( राजतरङ्गिणी 4 487 )

The study of the महाभाष्य was again forsaken by the scholars misled by the sophists वैजि, सौभन, हय्येन &c The causes thereof are recounted by भर्तृहरि in the stanzas beginning with प्रापेण सन्नेपरुचौन् &c quoted before It is said that only one single MS of it once existed in the whole of India —Add's भर्तृहरि—

(14) प्रागुदञ्चौ विभजते हंस क्षीरीदक्षे यथा ।

विदुषा शब्दसिद्धयर्थे सा न पातु श्रावती ॥ १ ॥

(15) In the Drama मुद्राराक्षस by विशाखदत्त, चाणक्य, कौटिल्य and विश्वगुप्त are found to be the names of one and the same person नवनन्दान् द्विजः कश्चित् सपुत्रानुद्दिश्यतीति श्रीमहागवत पद्यव्याख्यानं द्विज कौटिल्यवात्स्यायनादिपर्यायं चाणक्य इति श्रीधरस्वामी ।



य पतञ्जलिं शिष्येभ्यो भण्टो व्याकरणागमः ।  
 काले स दाक्षिणात्येषु ग्रन्थमात्रे व्यवस्थित ॥  
 पर्वतादागम लब्ध्वा भाष्यवीजानुसारिभि ।  
 स नीलो बहुशाखल चन्द्राचार्यादिभिः पुन ॥ २ ॥  
 न्यायप्रस्थानमार्गीलानभ्यस्य स्वञ्ज दर्शनम् ।  
 प्रणीतो गुरुणास्माकमथमागमसयह ॥ २ ॥

This is also confirmed by the राजतरङ्गिणी—

चन्द्राचार्यादिभिर्लब्धादिषु तस्मात् तदागमम् ।  
 प्रवर्तित महाभाष्य स्वञ्ज व्याकरणं महत् ॥ १ ॥

if the Grammarian चन्द्र d d really live during the reign of Abhimanyu, king of Kasmira Here तस्मात् evidently means from Abhimanyu So according to some चन्द्राचार्य्य and अभिमन्यु are co eval But others assert that चन्द्राचार्य्य or चन्द्रगोमिन, the author of the चन्द्रव्याकरण, lived in 465 A D It is inferred from an example— अजयद् गुप्तो ह्येषाम्—given by him in his grammar, in imitation of अरुणद् यवनः साकितम् cited by पतञ्जलि to exemplify a वक्तिञ्ज in 3 2 111 Another Grammarian वसुरात is said to have been a pupil of चन्द्रगोमिन् in 480 A D Some take वसुरात as the preceptor of भर्तृहरि If so, he might have got this pupil in his very old age, as भर्तृहरि died in 651 A D So the study of the महाभाष्य seems to have been again current since the 5th century A D

Poetical passages in large number are found in the महाभाष्य । एति जोवन्तसानन्दो नर वर्षशतादपि in 3 1 67 It occurs also in the रामायण ( Book V 36 ) The couplet in 6 1 84

कर्त्तुं प्राणा व्यतक्रामन्ति यून, स्थविर आयति ।  
 प्रदुल्यानाभिःवादाभ्या पुनस्तान् प्रतिपद्यते ॥ १ ॥

Is found in the मनुसंहिता । काल पचति भूतानि काल सहर्षति प्रजा in 3 3 167 is in the हारीतसंहिता and the महाभारत । अहरदृन्मयमात्रो गामश्च पुरुष पश्यम् । वैवस्वती न दृष्यति सुरया इव दुर्मदो in 2 2 29 is in the महाभारत too In 2 3 35 is

दूरादावसथान्मुच दूरात् पादावसेचनम् ।  
 दूराच्च भाष्य दस्युभ्यो दूराच्च कुपिताद् गुरोः ॥ १ ॥

In 2 2 29 is

उपास्तात स्थूलसिक्त तूष्णेद्भङ्ग महाऋदम् ।  
 द्रोणश्चेदशको गन्तु सा त्वा ताता कृताकृते ॥ १ ॥

In 1 4 3 is

यस्मिन् दश सहस्राणि पुत्रे जाते गवा ददौ ।  
 ब्राह्मणेभ्य प्रियास्त्रिभ्य सोऽयमुक्तेन जीवति ॥ १ ॥

In 1 3 25 we get

बहूनामप्यचित्ता नामिकी भवति चित्तवान् ।  
 पश्य वामरसेन्देऽस्मिन् यदकं हुपतिष्ठते ॥ १ ॥  
 सव सस्या सच्चिोऽयमेवोऽपि हि प्रथा वयम् ।  
 एतदप्यस्य कापय यदकंमुपातिष्ठति ॥ २ ॥

- In 4 1 93 1S कुतश्चरति मायूरिः केन कापिञ्जलि क्वथ ।  
आह्वयेन च दृष्टस्य पाञ्जिः सुतसमो मत ॥ १ ।
- In 4 1 48 1S वीणि यस्यावदातानि विद्या योनिश्च कर्म च ।  
एतच्छिवे विजानीहि ब्राह्मणाग्रस्य लक्षणम् ॥ १ ।
- In 2 3 13 वाताय कपिला विद्युदातपायातिलोहिनौ ।  
कृष्णा सर्व्वविनाशाय दुभिन्दाय सिता भवेत् ॥ १ ॥
- In 2 3 36 चर्मणि ह्रीपिन हृत्ति दन्तयो ह्रैन्ति कुञ्जरम् ।  
वेश्शु चमरी हन्ति सौमि पुष्कलको हृत ॥ १ ॥
- In 3 1 48 नाकसिष्टसुख याति सुयुक्तेवैडवारधैः ।  
अथ पत्काषिण्यो यान्ति येऽचौकमतभाषिणः ॥ १ ॥
- In 5 1 115 तपः श्रुतञ्च योनिश्च एतद् ब्राह्मणकारकम् ।  
तप श्रुताभ्या यो ह्रीनो जातिब्राह्मण एव स ॥ १ ॥
- In 8 1 8 1S सामृतै पाणिभिर्भ्रन्ति गुरवो न विधीन्विते ।  
लालनाग्रयिण्यो दीषा साडनाग्रयिण्यो गुणा ॥ १ ॥

Many other verses such as वरतनु सम्प्रवदन्ति कुक्कुटाः, असिद्धितैर्योऽनुससार पारडव, महोपालवच' शुक्ला जुष्टु पुष्यमाणवाः सङ्गषण्डितैयस्य बल कृष्णस्य वडताम् &c are there This shows that Sanskrit literature was then Sufficiently developed In the भाष्य of 3 3. 167 and elsewhere (specially in the पस्यग्रा) many other stanzas, current then as adages, are to be found Dramatic representations and the public recitations of ancient texts are also hinted in the भाष्य of III 1 26 by ये तावदेते शोभिका नाम, एते प्रत्यक्ष कस चातयन्ति प्रत्यक्षञ्च बलि वन्ध्यतीति । . यत्किञ्चु कथ यत्र शब्दयत्यनमात्र लक्ष्यते ? (16) &c .

(7) भर्तृहरि ।

भर्तृहरि is the name of the author or authors of three grammatical works and three didactic poems These are a commentary on the महाभाष्य, the वाक्यपदीय, the भागवत्ति, the वैराग्यशतक, the नीतिशतक, and the शृङ्गारशतक, Kaiyata in writing his Bhashya Prodeepa often availed of the first with the acknowledgment—

“तथापि हरिवङ्गेन सारिण्य ग्रन्थसिंतुना ।

कसमाय ग्रनै' पार तस्य प्रासाच्चि पङ्कवत्' ॥ १ ॥

Itsing in a part of his book, makes भर्तृहरि the author of a commentary on पाणिनि—He calls it “pei na”, which is surmised by the Japanese translator

(16) शोभिका नाम कसायनुकारिणो नगाना व्याख्यानोपाध्याया ।

यत्किञ्चिद्विदित कयकेवित्यथ इति केयट' ।

(Mr J Takukusu) to be the "Veda Vritti" or 'वेदावृत्ति' (17) Says I tsing—"A person who has studied so far as this book, is said to have mastered Grammatical Science" Now this "Peina" is probably the भागवृत्ति which was a commentary on the अष्टाध्यायी The भागवृत्ति is referred to by हरदत्त, मैत्रेयरचित, पुरुषोत्तमदेव, शरणदेव, शोपतिदत्त, माधव (सायनाचार्य), भट्टोजि and others As to its authorship, the following statement is found in the तन्त्रप्रदीप (a commentary on the काशिका and the व्यास, perhaps also called the वृत्तिप्रदीप) by मैत्रेय रचित on the Sutra VIII III 21-VIz —"भर्तृहरिणा चास्य नित्यायतैवोक्ता । तथाच भागवृत्तिज्ञता प्रत्युदा हरणमुपन्यस्य तन्ने उत तन्त्रयुतमिति । वामनोऽपि लोपिनैवोदाहरणमुक्तवान् ।"—शरणदेव says in his दुर्वटवृत्ति on the Sutra VIII III 37 —"उपराम उदयाम इत्येव भवतीति भर्तृहरिणा भागवृत्तिज्ञता चीकम् ।" वृत्तिधराचाथ्य the author of the भाषावृत्त्यर्थविवृति, a commentary on the भाषावृत्ति by पुरुषोत्तमदेव, remarks in the end of his book—"भागवृत्ति-भर्तृहरिणा विरचिता श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रादिष्टा ।" This श्रीधरसेन might be the third king of that name of वलभी, whose reign terminated in about 629 A D Or it might be an error on the part of वृत्तिधर, arising from the belief entertained by some, that the poet of the भट्टिकाव्य and the Grammarian भर्तृहरि are identical.—I tsing also speaks of the वाक्यप्रदीप by भर्तृहरि and gives 651 A D as the year of his death

Now the author of the भट्टिकाव्य observes काव्यमिदं विहितं मया वलभ्या श्रीधरसेननरेन्द्रपालितायाम् ।" There is a variant here viz श्रीधरसुननरेन्द्रपालितायाम् । In Dandin's दशकुमारचरित is the passage अत्रि सौराष्ट्रेषु वलभी नाम नगरी, It is indentified with the modern country Wala in Kathawar Sridhar en I, King of वलभी was succeeded by his brother द्रोणसिंह in 502 A D Another Dharasena or Sridharasen II reigned over वलभी in 517 A D Next, Sridhara-Sena III reigned there till 629 A D The poet भट्टि had likely one of these Dharasenas as his patron That he is different from भर्तृहरि, the author of the भागवृत्ति and is anterior to the latter, is clear enough, as the grammarian finds fault with the poet sometimes and sometimes justifies him On आह्वय ना रघूत्तमम् in the भट्टिकाव्य, the भागवृत्ति asserts प्रसाद एवायम् (18) । Again on प्राक् केकयीतो भरतस्ततोऽभूत् says भागवृत्ति—"शाङ्करवाद यजो डीनिति डीच् (19) ।

Regarding the author of the three Satakas named above, there is a tradition that, mortified at his wife's infidelity, he renounced the world and became a mendicant I tsing alludes to and admires a similar event in the life of the Grammarian भर्तृहरि who had exchanged his riches for the life of a devotee This cannot, of course, be sufficient for asserting that the writer of

(17) May not the "Veda Vritti" as well be a corruption of the word भिजवृत्ति वा भेदवृत्ति ie भागवृत्ति ?

(18) Quoted by भट्टोजि in the सिद्धान्तकौमुदी on the Sutra आडो यमहन (१।२।२८) ।

(19) Quoted by पुरुषोत्तमदेव in the भाषावृत्ति on the Sutra न प्राच्यभगोद्विद्यौधेया-दिभ्यः (४।१।१७८) ।

the नीतिशतक and वैराग्यशतक is the same personage as the author of the वाक्यपदीय or the भागवत्तत्त्व. Besides, the Satakas are more or less eclectic in which 'stanzas of later writers even, are found incorporated

According to the न्यासकार, there was a चूर्णभट्टिहृत्त on the अष्टाध्यायी and it had been composed earlier than the काशिका. On the other hand, I tsing's assertion that भर्तृहरि had written a commentary on the चूर्णि, is well known. चूर्णि might have been changed to चूर्लि, चुलि or चुनि through provincialism or manipulations of the scribes. — In the काशिका, a वृत्ति is referred to in VIII III 48 yiz — “भाष्ये वृत्तौ च नित्य समासेऽनुत्तरपदस्थस्यैव ( 8 3 45 ) परमसरपि कृच्छिकैव्येतेव प्रबुद्धाहरणम् ।” Most likely this वृत्ति is the भागवत्तत्त्व. The order in which it is stated seems to make it a later work than the महाभाष्य. According to I tsing, Bhatrihari's death took place ten years earlier than Jayaditya's. So the latter might easily consult the former's work. The term वृत्ति in the opening line वृत्तौ भाष्य तथा घातुनामपारायणादिषु of the काशिका, may be a work prior in time to the महाभाष्य and different from the वृत्ति mentioned in VIII III 48. The one might be the भागवत्तत्त्व by भर्तृहरि and the other चूर्णवृत्ति or कृष्णवृत्ति ।

The word वाक्यपदीय occurs as an example to IV III 88 in the काशिका, yiz — “शब्दाद्यसम्बन्धीय प्रकरण वाक्यपदीयम् ।” कैयट also names it, as already stated, and repeatedly quotes from it. The observation that भर्तृहरि lived in about 800 A D goes against I tsing's assertion. This may be true in the case of the poet of the three *satakas*, but not of the grammarian. Though the pseudo-*varatika* मणोवादीना प्रतिषेधो वक्तव्य in I L II is rejected by भर्तृहरि and adopted by जयादित्य, there is no inconsistency as to their synchronism. As this वार्तिक was not given by काश्यप and पतञ्जलि, भर्तृहरि did not take it in. But the Buddhist author either composed it himself or transferred it to his book from some older scholium, thinking इव, and not व, following such words as मणौ, दन्पतौ, &c. Other pseudo *varitikas*, such as घमाच्चेति वक्तव्यम् in IV. I 85, (20) are also found in the काशिका ।

(8) गल्लूरवृत्ति or निर्भूरवृत्ति ।

Nothing more is known of this treatise than that it is mentioned by the न्यासकार and once quoted by श्रीपतिदत्त in his कातन्त्रपरिशिष्ट । So its author too is now unknown

(9) जयादित्य and वामन ।

These two are the authors of the काशिका । जयादित्य died in 661 A D. I tsing describes him as the author of the Sutra Vritti identified with the काशिका । But the Indian scholars take the Kasika as the joint work of two writers

(20) This वार्तिक is found exemplified in ancient as well as modern works. For instance—याम्येन चाभवन् केशा बाह्वो विष्णुनेजसति देवोमाहात्म्ये । यति चेतसि नापुत्राम शतशो याम्या पुनर्यातना इति कुसुमाञ्जलावाचाम्ये उदयन ।

जयादित्य and वामन । जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि discourses in III 1, 33 on a contradiction arising from two opposite statements in III 1, 33 and VII 1 58 in the काशिका and he attempts to remove it thus —

“नास्ति विरोध । भिन्नकर्तृकत्वात् । इदं हि जयादित्यस्य वचनम् । तत् पुनर्वाचनस्य । वामनवृत्तौ तु तासिसिचोरिकार उच्चारणार्थो नानुबन्ध पश्यते । तेन विरोधो नाशङ्कनीय । केन पुनरभिसन्धिना जयादित्यस्तासिरिकारस्यानुनासिकलोपप्रतिबन्धाद्येता कृतवान् ? वामनस्तु उच्चारणार्थताम् ? श्रूयताम् । & ”

He again notices a difference of views between the two authors in I 1 5,—

‘ग्लानिस्थश्चेत्तत्र (3, 2 13) जयादित्यवृत्तौ गम्य . शुक्रः कितौखत्रापि (7 2 11) जयादित्य वृत्तौ गम्य । वामनस्य ल्वेतत् सर्वमनभिमतम् । तथाहि तस्यैव सूत्रस्य (7 2 11) तद्विरचितताया वृत्तौ गम्य केचिदत्र द्विककारनिर्देशेन गकारप्रश्लेष वर्णयन्तीति ।’

हरदत्त too echoes the statement by the व्यासकार in III 1 33 in his पदमञ्जरी—

‘एवं तावन् जयादित्येनासिद्धत्वमाश्रित्य तस्मिन्निर्णयमनुनासिकलोपप्रतिषेधायमित्युक्तम् । वामनस्तु टिनोपस्य शिद्धत्वादेव नलोपो न भविष्यतीति मन्यमान इटितोरित्यत्र (7 1 58) वक्ष्यति तासिसिचोरिदित् काय्य नास्तीत्युच्चारणार्थो निरनुनासिक इकारः पठ्यत इति ।’

Again in II 11 17 हरदत्त takes लृच् क्रीडाजीविकयोर्नास्तीति as the opinion of जयादित्य and then says वामनस्त्वक्ने जीविकार्थे (6 2 73) इत्यत्राक इति किम् ? रमणीयकत्वेति जीविकाया लृच् प्रत्युदाहरिष्यति ।

भट्टोजि also maintains this joint authorship in his प्रौढमनोरमा in V 14 42 viz —एतच्च सर्वं जयादित्यमतेनोक्तम् । वामनस्तु मन्यते ज्ञातिशब्देभ्योऽपि भवत्येव । Again in the शब्दकौस्तुभ, on I 1, 5 he says जयादित्योऽप्येवम् । वामनस्तु न कापि गकारप्रश्लेषः कार्य इत्याह ।

So the काशिका is the joint work of जयादित्य and वामन । It is desirable to find out their individual shares in it । हरिदीक्षित asserts in his शब्दरत्न on V 14 42 “प्रथमद्वितयपञ्चमषष्ठा जयादित्यकृतवृत्तयः । इतरे वामनकृतवृत्तय इत्यभियुक्ताः ।’ In Pundit Balshastrin’s printed edition of the काशिका, the first four Adhyayas are assigned to जयादित्य and the rest to वामन । This view is now generally accepted । But the observation by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि quoted above —शुक्रः कितौखत्रापि (7 2 19) जयादित्यवृत्तौ गम्य &c—throws some doubt on it । Did जयादित्य write a complete commentary on the काशिका ? Besides, it is strange that I-tsing is totally silent about वामन । Says he of जयादित्य—

“He was a man of great ability । His literary power was very striking । He understood things which he had heard once, not requiring to be taught twice । It is now nearly thirty years since his death ।’

I-tsing composed his book in 691 A. D. । So Jayaditya’s death occurred in 661 A. D. । Now why within so short a time is Jayaditya’s colleague entirely ignored by I-tsing ? In the काशिका, the Indian scholars found contradictory allegations and they reconciled them by ascribing them to the two authors जयादित्य and वामन । This shows that वामन could neither be a different name nor a surname of the other—Was it because वामन held then a subordinate position, either as a pupil of the other or a very new writer who had not therefore attained yet reputation enough to be named as an author ? Or were the last four Adhyayas of the book a subsequent addition to, or a recast by वामन of the form in which जयादित्य had left them ? If वामन were either an

intimate friend or a pupil of the other, he might undertake this task of retouching the work left by जयादित्य, if he thought it requiring further improvement. That जयादित्य might have left his own comments on the last four Adhyayas appear not altogether improbable from the assertion of the व्यासकार on I 1 5—“शुक्रं कितौल्यवापि (7 2 11) जयादित्यवृत्तौ यय ।” Probably वासन wrote down his share of the काशिका shortly after Itsing had left India and so he is not at all mentioned by the former Unless there be some such reasons, it cannot be likely that Itsing could avoid or forget वासन within so short a time as between the composition of the काशिका (that is Jayaditya’s सूत्रवृत्ति) and his own book, the Record of the Buddhist Religion

In the काशिका are found references to पदशेषकार, साय्यन्दिनि and भट्टाचार्य (1 2 36) and quotations from the रामायण, महाभारत, मनुसंहिता, भारवि and नानार्थकोष, besides, stray lines such as सा हि तस्य धनक्रीता प्राणेशोऽपि गरीयसी, केनेद लिखित चित्र मनोनेत्र-विकाशि यत्, घटदिति गम्भीरमरुदेर्नदितम् &c. The verse सा हि तस्य धनक्रीता &c is assigned to भट्टि by माधव in his धातुवृत्ति (on the root डृक्क्रीच्) and भट्टेजि in his शब्दकौस्तुभ in II 11 19 But it is not met with in the भट्टिकाव्य. To II 1 55 in the काशिका, the examples ह्रस्वद्वयदा and न्ययोधपरिमञ्जला and again to VI 2 2 these two and दूर्वाकाण्डश्यामा are supplied This reminds one of the stanza in the भट्टिकाव्य

योषिद्वन्द्वारिका तस्य दयिता हसनादिभौ ।

दूर्वाकाण्डमिव श्यामा न्यगरीधपरिमञ्जला ॥ १ ॥ (V 18)

If there be any borrowing here, the grammarian is the borrower, supposing that the भागवृत्ति is prior to the काशिका। As however जयादित्य quotes भारवि and refers to the वाक्यपदीय, Itsing’s chronology is sufficiently borne out Nothing is known of the life, parentage &c of जयादित्य and वासन It is said that they were Buddhists, for they commenced their work without any statement of salutation to a god, supplied such an Brahminic illustration as नयते चार्वा लोकाश्रते &c, mutilated the aphorisms of the sage or often augmented them by interpolations No Brahmin classical author would do it, as it would lead to a wrong पारायण and be a sacrilege

This famous work the काशिकावृत्ति, sometimes called the सङ्घृत्ति, or the महावृत्ति, is now the only extant independent complete commentary on the अष्टाध्याये written in accordance with the order of the Sutras as laid down by पाणिनि himself The शब्दकौस्तुभ would have been another such work independently composed, if भट्टेजि could finish it If is said that he died before its completion The व्याकरण मितान्तरा by अन्नम्भट्ट, (21) the वैयाकरणसुवस्व by धरणोद्योतकमीनाथ composed in 1809 A D

(21) The beginning of the व्याकरणमितान्तरा is

शिव सास्व नमस्कृत्य गणेशं सरस्वतीम् ।

पाणिनीयसतेनाह वृत्तिं कुर्वे मितान्तराम् ॥ १ ॥

and the colophon is—

यन्मविस्तरभौक्त्य इय वृत्तिर्मया कृता ।

यथा व्याकरणं सर्वं करस्थामलकादते ॥ १ ॥

on the request by Henry Colebrook (22) and the Scholium prepared in 1839 42 A D by two unknown pundits appointed by Dr Boethlinck, were all, more or less, based on the materials supplied by the काशिका They are not enough to make one unders and पाणिनि fully and clearly In fact, had the काशिका been not written at all or defunct, the need for a systematic Sanskrit Grammar treating both the holy and profane parts of the language, would have been awfully great The study of the अष्टाध्यायी then would have disappeared altogether or lingered only with a very few scholars Its importance and necessity cannot therefore be overstated The term काशिका is thus explained—काशवति प्रकाशयति सूत्रार्थमिति काशिका। काश्या भवा वा। हरदत्त favours the second etymology,—“काशिकेति देशतोऽभिधानम्। काशिषु भवा।”—So they prepared it at Benares,—that eternal city and centre of Sanskrit learning in India

(10) जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि ।

जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is the author of the काशिकाविवरणपञ्चिका It is variously called the काशिकाविवरणपञ्चिका, काशिकाविवरणपञ्चिका, काशिकान्यास, जिनेन्द्रन्यास or the न्यास The name न्यास is because of its methodical justification of the statements of the text commented upon (23) The न्यास was most likely the first of the commentaries written on the Kasika Another of its commentaries is the पदमञ्जरी by हरदत्तमिश्र Says he in the Introduction of his book

तात पञ्चकुमाराख्य प्रणय्याम्बा श्रिय तथा ।

ज्येष्ठं चाग्निकुमाराख्यमाचार्य्यमपराजितम् ॥ १ ॥

यश्चिराय हरदत्तसन्नया विद्युतो दशसु दिक्षु दक्षिण ।

उज्जहार पदमञ्जरीमसौ शब्दशास्त्रसहकारपादपात ॥ ३ ॥

The variants in (1) are रुद्रकुमाराख्यम्, पञ्चकुमाराख्यम् and चाग्निकुमाराख्यम् । if these variants are the real readings and contain आर्य्य, हरदत्त was clearly a Madras Iyer. From a varnacular word कूचमञ्चि used by him in his book, this assertion is further confirmed He often speaks of his own merit thus —

(22) The colophan of the वैयाकरणसर्वस्व runs thus—

देशं श्रीमति वङ्गनाम्नि नगरे श्रीकल्लकताभिषे

श्रीमत्तामसचरितक कुलवुरुक्साह्वेवदत्ताग्रया ।

प्रारब्धं धरणीधरेण विदुषा व्याख्यानक पाणिनेः

सूत्राणां समनुक्रमेण च महाभाष्येण तट्टीकया ॥ १ ॥

कौमुद्यापि च काशिकासहितया सशुक्लक वार्तिकै

सहस्रत् सर्वगणै सहैव च परीभाषेष्टिभि र्निश्चितम् ।

मूढानां द्रुतबोधद च समहत् सवोपकारक्षम

काशीनाथ इतीरितो बुधवर पूर्णोच्काराय तत ॥ २ ॥

गौरीपुत्रसुखर्तुनागधरणीसवत्सरे (१८६६) वैक्रमे

भूवैश्वानरसप्तचन्द्रकमिते शके (१७३१) तपस्ये सिते ।

पक्षे सूयतिथौ विधौ सुदिवसे विप्रस्तु सारस्वतो

वावूरामसमाख्यायातिविदितो मुद्राचरैर् न्यस्तवान् ॥ ३ ॥

(23) न्यस्यते स्थाप्यते दृढीक्रियतेऽनेनेति न्यास, ।

एव प्रकटितोऽस्माभिर्भाव्ये परिचय पर ।  
तस्य नि शेषतो मन्वे प्रतिपत्तापि दुर्लभ ॥१॥  
Again प्रक्रियातकंगहनप्रविष्टो हृष्टमानस ।  
हरदत्तहरि स्त्रैर विहरन् केन वार्यति ॥१॥

Though he boasts of the superiority of his work (24) to all other commonaries on the काशिका, said to be existing by hundreds, yet it is doubtful if he has been able to dislodge the न्याम from its pedestal of the first and best of its kind जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि was a grammarian of extraordinary acumen His grammatical knowledge and insight were intensely keen, his studies and acquirements vast, deep and varied His memory, as evidenced from his book, was wonderful His book is a veritable repository of minute, cogent and incisive reasonings Its sterling merits deservedly acquired for it, a worldwide fame The scholars sang its praises —

यत पञ्जिकानावात्मामासाद्य सुधियं सुखम् ।  
तरन्ति काशिकाभोधिं स निनेन्द्रो जयत्ययम् ॥ १ ॥

and again

उच्चारित शेषमुखैरभेषैर्व्याख्यामृत शब्दमहार्णवस्य ।  
न्यासीकृत येन जिनेन्द्रकेन तस्मै नमः शाब्दिकवन्दिताय ॥१॥

मृष्टिधराचार्य of the भाषावृत्त्यर्थविद्वत्ति based his work on it and he says —

न्यासग्रन्थार्थतातपर्यपथ्यालोचनशालिभिः ।  
बोधोऽय कक्षणावद्भिः कृतिभिर् मे परिश्रम ॥ १ ॥

The न्याम has a commentary of its own in common with the काशिका by मन्वेयरन्त It is called the तन्त्रप्रदीप Says मैत्रेय in his धातुप्रदीप—

मञ्जुघोषप्रसादेन धातूना वृत्तिसारभे ।  
बहुश्रोऽसून् यथा भीम प्रीक्तवास्तवदागमात् ॥ १ ॥  
Again in the colophon वृत्तिन्यासी (स)ससुद्दिश्य कृतवान् ग्रन्थवित्तरम् ।  
मात्वा तन्त्रप्रदीप यो विद्वतास्तेन धातव ॥ २ ॥  
आकृत्य भाष्यजलधे रथ धातुनामपारायणक्षपणपाणिनिशास्त्रवेदी ।  
कालापचान्द्रमततत्त्वविभागदत्तो धातुप्रदीपमकरोज्जगतो हिताय ॥ ३ ॥  
He composed his books in about 1100 A D

Some say that this तन्त्रप्रदीप is probably identical with the अनुन्यास, or the न्यासोद्धीत । भाषवाचार्य often refers to it by the name of वृत्तिप्रदीप after the भाष्यप्रदीप by कौयट ।

Nothing is known regarding the birth place, parentage and life of the न्यासकार । बोधिसत्त्वदेशीयाचार्य being a title of his, it is plain that he was a Buddhist Some take him as a जैन । भद्रोजि called him वेदवाह्य (25), because he was not a

(24) अविचारितरमणौय काम व्याख्याशत भवतु वृत्तेः ।

हृदयङ्गमा भविष्यति गुणगृह्याणामियं व्याख्या ॥ १ ॥”

(25) “यत्तु न्यासकृतोक्त सुद्वलानीशब्दे द्वितीय उदात्त इति तद्वेदवाह्यत्वप्रयुक्तमेव । लिखिते (६११६३) प्रत्ययात् पूर्वस्य विधीयमानं सन्निहितमाहुकं विहाय द्वितीये प्रवर्षत इत्यत्र वीजाभावात् । सकलवेदविक्रपाठरोधाच्च ।” ( प्रौढमनोरमा, वैदिकप्रक्रिया on 4 I 49)



Brahmin बोधिसत्त्वदेशीय is by the तद्धित affix देशीयर् (५।१।६७)। Another view asserts देशीय with the affix क् under गहादि (४।२।३८) or with क् to बोधिसत्त्वदेश by एङ् प्राचा देशे (१।१।७५)। As to his age the internal evidences are very few and far between जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि names a poem सीताहरण in II 1 15 There is nothing to show that the न्यासकार means by it the जानकीहरण by the Buddhist poet कुमारदास In VI 1 74, he quotes सा बालिपथमन्त्रगा which is from the रामायण (Book IV 30 81 and 34 18) In II 11 16 is भीष्मः कुरुणा भयशोकहर्त्ता (ला) likely from the महाभारत In IV 1 20 is the stanza

पिता रक्षति कौमारि भर्त्ता रक्षति यौवने ।  
पुत्रस्तु स्याविरि भावे न स्त्री खातन्त्रामर्हति ॥ १ ॥

Which occurs in the मनुसंहिता In III 11 87 he discourses on व्रतस्य हन्तु which may remind one of the line व्रतस्य हन्तुः कुलिशं कुण्डिताश्रीव लक्ष्यते in the कुमारसम्भव in VIII 2 80 is अहरहर्नयमानो गामन्त्र पुरुष पश्यम् which is from the महाभारत, In III 11 21 is जातिरियं किङ्करी in III 11 174 कालो हरिश्चन्द्र इव प्रजानाम्, in VI 2 187 is तत्रोपासितलोकभर्त्ता, in VI 11 67 गिरो मे श्रीयशो मे श्री and in VIII 14 16, अपि शक पचानस्य सुखा वै मघवन् गृह्णा । But their sources have not been traced

In II 1 17 stands a quotation प्राज्ञे कल्याणनामानावेतौ तिष्यपुनर्वत् which is also found, slightly changed, in the साहित्यदर्पण To illustrate the dramatic लक्षण अनुक्तसिद्धि in chapter VI the author sets down “विशेषार्थोच्यतेऽनुक्तमिद्विरुद्धीयते यथा गृह्णन्ववाटिकाया—

दृश्यते तन्नि यावेतौ चारुचन्द्रमस प्रति ।  
प्राज्ञे कल्याणनामानावुभौ तिष्यपुनर्वत् ॥ १ ॥

One रामचरणतकवागीश who wrote a commentary on the साहित्यदर्पण, by name the साहित्यदर्पणविवृति, in 1702 A D, glossed over it thus —

“ऊहविस्तारस्तर्कातिशयः । दृश्यते इति । गृह्णोपवने विश्वमिदमसमीपे श्रीरामलक्ष्मणौ दृष्ट्वा सीता सम्बोध्य तत्सखीना वितर्कवर्षणमिदम् । अत्र चन्द्रादीना पृथिव्यामसम्भवे वितर्कातिशयः ।”

Is this गृह्णन्ववाटिकायाम् the name of a book? Or a portion of the text quoted from a book, indicating the spot from which the maidens addressed सीता ?

∴ There is a passage (26) in the MS of the न्यास belonging to the Deccan college, Poona, in which a quotation is found from the अमरकोष viz — “अथवा पुन सिद्धान्तः । तन्न प्रधाने सिद्धान्त इत्यमरः ।” But it does not occur in the Bengal MS in Bengali characters, ferreted out from Bengal, and now deposited in the Varendra Research Society of Rajshahi, nor in the MS in Malayalam characters, which is in the Library of Trivancore Government (27) So it cannot be safely asserted that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि had quoted अमरसिंह ।

~~200-~~

20(26) P 2 in the Text

(27) M M Pundit I Go rputi Sastri assured the editor of this Vide his letter printed in the next page 1000 Vol I

As for the external evidence, it is known from I tsing that जयादित्य died in 661 A D Now जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि did not write his न्यास within a very short time after Jayaditya's demise It is clear from the following passages of it —

(a) In I 1 5 writes the न्यासकार—“अन्ते तूत्तरसूत्रे कथिता श्री रथिता श्व इत्यनन्तरमनेन ग्रथेन भवितव्यम् । इह तु दुर्विन्यासकाकुपदजनितभ्रान्तिभि कुल्लिखकैर लिखितमिति वर्षयन्ति ।

(b) In IV 1 2—“श्रौट्यकार सुडिति प्रत्याहारग्रहणाय । इतौ त्वेप ग्रथौ नास्ति । भवितव्य त्वनेन । लेखकप्रमाददोषादिदानोमन्तर्हित ।”

(c) In VI III 79—“ससग्रहमित्येतदुदाहरण प्रमादादिदानोमनै कुल्लिखकैर्लिखितम् ।”

This shows that the use and study of the काशिका had spread vastly and ranged for a sufficient time before the न्यास was composed Otherwise it is hardly possible for the scribes to so soon forget the order of words in transcription of any recently composed book The complaint of the commentator consists of the words इदानोम् and इदानोत्तने This clearly bespeaks a certain period of time sufficiently long and previously elapsed after which the copyists were likely to be careless in their work

Now मैत्रेयरचित् the commentator on the न्यास is quoted by शरणदेव in his दुर्घटबृत्ति written in 1172 A D मैत्रेयरचित् refers to कैयट and quotes माघ in his तन्त्रप्रदीप । It will be presently shown that माघ names the न्यास । पुरुषोत्तमदेव mentioned in the दुर्घटबृत्ति, quotes न्यासकार and कैयट in his भाषावृत्ति composed in about 1150 A D कैयट often refers to भर्षुहरि (of the वाक्यप्रदीप ) and बृत्तिकार (जयादित्य) directly and speaks of the न्यासकार in the भाष्यप्रदीप indirectly thus —

(a) In III 1 III, on the Sutra ई च खनः ( ३।१।११ ) says न्यासकार—“इयोरिकारयो प्रश्नेषनिर्देशः । तत्र यो द्वितीय इवर्णं स ये ( 6 4 43 ) चेत्वात्त्ववावा यथा स्यादित्येवमर्थे ।” Now कैयट remarks “द्वौचोच्चारणे भाष्यकारेण प्रत्याख्याते केचित् प्रश्नेषनिर्देशेन द्वितीय इकारो ये विभाषित्वात्स्वस्य ( 6 4 43 ) पक्षे परत्वात् प्राप्तस्य वाधनाय इत्याह । तदयुक्तम् । क्वप्सन्नियोगेन विधीयमानस्येत्स्वस्यान्तरङ्गत्वात् ।”

(b) Again in VII III 70 (चीलोपी लेटि वा) कैयट observes—“केचित्त्वित्यमागमशासनमित्यस्य ज्ञापक वाग्रहण वर्षयन्ति । अनित्यत्वात् तस्य षसति ददादिति न स्यादिति । तत्सिद्धये वाग्रहण क्रियमाणमेना परिभाषा ज्ञापयति ।

This assertion that the term वा in VII III, 70 is the indicatory of the परिभाषा quoted above, stands in the न्यास in VII 1 1 viz —

अनित्यता पुनरागमशासनस्य घी लोपी लेटि वेल्ल ( 7 3 70 ) वाग्रहणाल्लिङ्गाद् विज्ञायते । नडि ददद् ददादित्यत्र नित्य घी लोपी मा भुदित्येवमर्थे क्रियते । यदि च नित्यमागमशासन स्याद् वाग्रहणमनर्थकं स्यात् । भवत् नित्यो लोप । सव्यपि वस्मि जेटोऽडाटा ( 3 4 94 ) इत्यटि हते ददद् ददादिति सिद्धात्वेव । अनित्यत्वे ल्वागमशासनस्याडागमाभावान्न सिध्यति । ततो वाचनमर्थवद् भवति ।”

From this elaborate explanation in which no previous writer is alluded to, it is clear that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is the first propagator of this view If so, कैयट refers to the न्यासकार and he must have flourished some time between 661 A D and 1100 A D This limit for कैयट is set down in consideration of the reference to him, by पुरुषोत्तमदेव who was most likely a Bengali He composed his भाषावृत्ति in about 1150 A D, and we may take 50 years as the minimum period for the circulation of the भाष्यप्रदीप in Bengal Again हरदत्त

often indirectly speaks of कैयट (28) and appears to have lived in 1100 A D हरदत्त, मैत्रेयवर्जित and पुरुषोत्तम appear to have been all coeval as no one of them refers to the others शरणादेव too does not speak of हरदत्त, but he quotes कैयट । Kaiyata introduces himself thus —

पदनाक्यप्रमाणानां पारं यातस्य धीमतः ।  
गुरोर्माँहेश्वरस्यापि कृत्वा चरणवन्दनम् ॥ १ ॥  
महाभाष्यार्णवावारपारीणं विद्वतिप्रवसम् ।  
प्रथागमविधास्येऽहं कैयटो जेयटात्मजः ॥ २ ॥

So his preceptor was one महेश्वर and father जैयट । One भीमसेन in his commentary सुधासागर on the काव्यप्रकाश, written in about 1723 A D asserts that कैयट was a brother to मन्मटभट्ट and उव्वट and flourished in काश्मीर । They say मन्मट lived in 1050 A D and so did उव्वट as they both referred to the king भोज in their works । मन्मट names भोज in his काव्यप्रकाश—“यद्द विद्वद्भवनेषु भोजनृपते स्तत्यागलीलायितम् ।” भोज was reigning in 1042 A D उव्वट in his ऋकप्रतिशाखाभाष्य says इति श्रीपार्षदव्याख्याया मानन्दपुरवासव्यवञ्जटपुत्रोव्वटकृते प्रतिशाखाभाष्ये पटल” and in his वाजसनेयसंहिताभाष्य says —

कष्यादीथ नमस्कृत्य अवन्यासुव्वटो वसन् ।  
मन्त्रभाष्यमिदं चक्रे भोजे पृष्टो प्रणमति ॥ १ ॥

Elsewhere is the statement —

मानन्दपुरवासव्यवञ्जटाखास्य सूनुरा ।  
मन्त्रभाष्यमिदं क्लृप्तं भोजे पृष्टो प्रणमति ॥ १ ॥

Which makes वञ्जट as his father and not जैयट, which jars with the assertion by भीमसेन in his सुधासागर inasmuch as कैयट himself says that जैयट was his father, It can however be defended by taking पितृव्यपुत्र (cousin) as the meaning of the term भ्राता (brother) here,—the term भ्राता may even indicate मातुलपुत्र, मातृव्यसौत्र्य and पितृव्यसौत्र्य । But from consideration of the age of हरदत्त, शरणादेव and पुरुषोत्तमदेव, कैयट may be taken to have lived in 1050 A D if not earlier

Now the stanza in the शिशुपालवध—

अनुत्सृज्यपदव्यासा सङ्घृष्टिं सन्निवन्तना ।  
शब्दविद्येव नो भाति राजनीतिरपस्यग ॥ १ ॥

really alludes to the व्यास । Going through the pages of the latter, the hit in the epithet अनुत्सृज्यपदव्यासा will be found very thoroughly appropriate । The reader will be amazed to find that जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि invariably and studiously rejects the vartikas and shows that whatever had been supplied by काव्यायन with Vartikas,

(28) E G says कैयट in 3 2 115 in forming the word परोत्त—“प्रतिपरसमनुभ्योऽन्व इति टच् समासान् । स च यद्यप्यव्ययीभावे विधीयते तथापि परशब्दस्यात्तिशब्देनाव्ययीभावसम्भवात् समासान्तरे विज्ञायते ।” Now हरदत्त remarks there “अन्वे तु प्रतिपरसमनुभ्योऽन्व इति शरतप्रथतिषु पाठादृच समासान् इत्याहुः । स च यद्यप्यव्ययीभावे विधीयते तथापि परशब्देनाव्ययीभावसम्भवात् समासान्तरे विज्ञायते ।” from such cases हरदत्त is clearly posterior to कैयट ।

could be independently formed and justified by the sutras of the अष्टाध्यायी The *varṭikas* were therefore absolutely needless, as things established by them, could be deduced from the very sutras—“सर्वे सूत्रे प्रतिष्ठितम्” । So the न्यास is really अनुत्सूत्रपद and Magha’s allusion to it in the stanza, is quite sure and certain साध is quoted by आनन्दवर्द्धन in his ध्वन्यालोक and घनिकाघनज्ञय in the दशरूप The दशरूप was composed in about 977 A D and आनन्दवर्द्धन lived in the reign (from 855 A D to 883 A D) of अश्वमेधसूनु son to सुखवर्मन् and a king, of काशीर Hence साध might be living in about 800 A D Taking the two limits of 661 A D (the year of Jayaditya’s death) and 800 A D the न्यास appears to have been composed in about 725 A D

Kielhorn’s statement that अनुत्सूत्रपदन्यासा does not refer to the न्यास, is not tenable and need not be relied on The term अनुत्सूत्र might be used in the महाभाष्य as many times as one may please, but marking the systematic way in which जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि having rejected every वार्तिक, maintains and props up the authority of the sutras only, साध could not mean anything but the न्यास in the aforesaid passage, when putting an epithet to the word शब्दविद्या It is also worth consideration how many renowned and important books there had been available on the शब्दविद्या when साध composed his poem It was सन्नित्वसना because it had in it the महाभाष्य which is a सन्नित्वसना Bhatrishan’s description,

ज्ञेयैऽय पतञ्जलिना गुरुणा तीर्थदर्शिता ।  
सर्वेषा न्यायवीजाना महाभाष्ये निवत्सनाम् ॥

leads to the idea that it was the content of all न्यायवीज and a सन्नित्वसना । सद्वृत्ति is the other qualification, because it had then in it भागवृत्ति by भट्टहरि and the काशिका वृत्ति by वासनजयादिव्य. The next important treatise in it is the न्यास So साध described the शब्दविद्या as enriched with all those works

Kielhorn’s other assertion that the पदमञ्जरी was the source of the न्यास is equally wrong हरदत्त names the न्यासकार directly in 4 1 22 of the पदमञ्जरी (29) and indirectly often as अपर आह, कश्चिदाह, क्वचित् &c .. and then quotes the passages of the न्यास For instances the reader is referred to the Sutras 3 3 67, 3 3 99 and 4 1 4 in the पदमञ्जरी and the न्यास in which he will find the quotations word for word from the later in the former

Vana’s हर्षचरित has a passage viz —तच् गुल्फा वाणस्य चत्वारः पितृव्यगुणा भातरः प्रसन्नवृत्तयो गृहीतवाक्याः कृतगुरुपदन्यासा न्यायवादिन सुकृतसग्रहाभ्यासगुणो लब्धसाधुशब्दा लोका इव व्याकरणेऽपि, परस्परस्य सुखानि व्यलोकयन् ।’ (Chapter III) This reading is from the Bombay निर्णयसागर Press edition. The edition of A A Fuhren is identical, as far as this passage is concerned, with it

Some say that owing to the *double entendres* in the simile लोक इव व्याकरणेऽपि, the word न्यास here refers to the जिनेन्द्रन्यास or the commentary on the Kaśika The words वृत्ति, वाक्य, न्यास and पद्यह are there The first may imply

the भागवत्तत्त्वं by भर्तृहरि or the काशिका by जयादित्य or any other earlier work such as कृषिदत्त or चूषिदत्त । वाक्य may indicate the वार्तिक by कात्यायन and संग्रह the work by व्याडि । Similarly न्यास may stand for the commentery on the Kasika

But the Calcutta edition of the हर्षचरित of 1876 reads “ भातर प्रसन्नप्रवृत्तयो गृहीतवाक्या कृतशुक्लान्यासा न्यायवादिन सुकृतसंगृहीतान्यासगुरवो लक्षसाधुशब्दा लोकादिव व्याकरणे ” The translation of the passage by S B Cowell and F W Thomas runs thus -- “Men of mild manners and cultures, holding the status of preceptors, expounders of Nyaya, deep in the study of able works, receiving only good words ( i e they are called good and as Grammarians they receive only good words) both in the world and in grammar ” An old commentary printed in the निर्णयसागर press and Fuhren’s edition takes न्यास as meaning “वृत्तिविवरणम्”, and does not say it is जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि’s work

So to take the word न्यास here, meaning the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका is probably a far stretched idea It is capable of getting several other interpretation perfectly connected with Grammar, though not indicating any particular Book Besides, there is the direct and positive statement of Itsing who had almost been a contemporary to the authors of the भागवत्तत्त्वं and काशिका, against the aforesaid assertion Vana lived in the reign of Harshavardana (606-648) of Kanoj His हर्षचरित was composed to glorify this monarch whereas Itsing’s statement made in 691 A D is that भर्तृहरि died in 651 A D and जयादित्य died in 661 A D If Itsing be right, Vana cannot even dream of the काशिकान्यास by जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि । Neither is there any ground to hold the Chines traveller’s statement as false and incredible

Another view is suggested to preserve the assertion that the term न्यास here really refers to a book The words वाक्य and संग्रह present no difficulty वृत्ति too may be some earlier work than the भागवत्तत्त्वं or the काशिका Similarly न्यास is some other न्यास which had appeared before Vana One न्यास is said to have been composed in the fifth century A D by देवनन्द or देवनन्दिन् । We shall presently speak of it If there had really existed any such न्यास before the seventh century A D the word in the passage may be taken as indicating a book Of course it is not the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

There is another important reference to the न्यासकार in the Rhetorical work by भानुदत्त, Says he —

शिल्पप्रयोगसाधनेषु न्यासकारसतेन वा ।  
तच्छा समस्तपठौर्कं न कथञ्चिदुदाहरित ॥ १ ॥  
सूत्रज्ञापकसाधनेषु ब्रह्महन्ता यथोदित ।  
अकेन च न कुर्वीत वृत्तिं तद्व्यसकी यथा ॥ २ ॥

In 2 2 16, न्यासकार asserts that a word ending with षष्ठो cannot be compounded with another derived with तच् । This opinion he repeats in IV. 1 33 in which he observes —

“अथ फलश्रुतीदत्त्वादिति । कथमत्र षष्ठीसमास ? कथञ्च न स्यात् ? कर्त्तरि चेति (२२१६) त्वाच्चा षष्ठीसमासप्रतिषेधात् । नैवार्यं त्वजन्तेन षष्ठीसमासः । किं तर्हि ? द्वितीयेति (२।१।२४) योगविभागात् त्वजन्तेन द्वितीयासमासः । अथवा याजकादिषु ग्रहीत्वशब्दो द्रष्टव्यः । तेन षष्ठीसमासे भविष्यति ।’ In III 11 87, in opposing the affix त्वच् he says “एवमपीह इवस्य हन्वुरिति त्वच् न प्राप्नोति । प्राथिकत्वाद्भ्रियमस्य न दोषः ।” So भासह perhaps means that शिष्टप्रयोगमात्रेण हेतुना अथवा न्यासकारमतेन हेतुना त्वाच् समस्तषष्ठीक कथञ्चिन्नोदाहरेत, that is, in accordance with the uses of the learned who never compound a त्वजन्त word with a षष्ठात् one or as the opinion of the न्यासकार is against such a compound, such words should never be used सूत्रज्ञापकमात्रेण likely refers to जनिकर्त्तुं प्रकृति. ( १।१।३० ) and तत्प्रयोगको हेतुश्च ( १।१।५५ ) ।

Now it is said that as there were many Nyasakaras, जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि might not be here intended by भासह But the अष्टाध्यायी is the chief of all other works on Sanskrit grammar जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि being the commentator on it, cannot but be the chief न्यासकार । For the same reason, he is likely the first of all other न्यासकार । It might be that other works were called न्यास in imitation of the name of his book In some MSS such as those in the Madras Government Library or in the Research Department of Kashmir State, he is mentioned as स्वधिरजिनेन्द्र It is either because he was ancient or old as he had likely been prior to the authors of the other Nyasas or because he was a revered personage with the Buddhists Bramin authors too similarly show their reverence to the sages, often calling them as ब्रह्म or ब्रह्मत् such as ब्रह्मसत्, ब्रह्मशातातप, ब्रह्मनारद, ब्रह्मवृत्, ब्रह्मनारद &c , implying either their great antiquity or revered position भासह therefore very likely alludes to him Had he referred to any other न्यासकार, he would have most likely qualified him, as the author of such as बोधिन्यास, शाकटायनन्यास, चैनेन्द्रन्यास, &c, Again Panini's grammar is the most authoritative one , therefore the न्यासकार belonging to it, was perhaps given preference to by भासह in his allusion No other न्यासकार belonging to the pure Paninian school is so familiarly known now अनुन्यास and न्यासोद्योत are, as their very names indicate, probably treatises on the न्यास itself A recent assertion is that there was another न्यासकार who lived in the 5th century A D His name was देवनन्द or देव नन्दन् and he had the title पृथ्वीपाद Though साधवाचार्य्य refers to the works of other न्यासकारs such as the बोधिन्यास, शाकटायनन्यास, चैनेन्द्रन्यास &c yet in his repeated statements such as वृत्तिन्यासपदसङ्ख्यादिविरीघात् &c, न्यासादौ तु &c, he invariably refers to the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका । Quotations from the न्यास given by हरदत्त, श्रीपति, अरण्यदेव, सैत्यरचित, पुरुषोत्तम, साधवाचार्य्य, भट्टोजि &c, all tally with the passages of this treatise and quotations from देवनन्द are nonexistent in these writers or if found elsewhere, they are very rare So inspite of the existence of many न्यासकार, these authors all seem to take जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि as the chief न्यासकार । भासह too similarly and most likely in his book, referred to and meant जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि and not देवनन्द Now one भट्टोजि wrote a commentary named the भासहविवरण, on the Rhetorical work by भासह He was one of the court pundits of जयापीड king of Kashmir, who reigned from 779 A D to 813 A D भट्टोजि, (also named

उद्भटाचार्य), composed another Rhetorical treatise named the कायालङ्कारमञ्जरी. In the commentary of this उद्भटाचार्य by प्रतोहारिन्दुगज, it is asserted that भट्टोजि had written the भासविवरण. This makes भास either a contemporary to उद्भट or one preceding him. We may therefore take भास living in 775 A D. But भास as stated above speaks of the न्यासकार. जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि was therefore prior to him and he might have prepared his न्यास by about 725—750 A D. Again कुमारिलभट्ट appears posterior by a few years only to the न्यासकार. They were the inhabitants of distant regions and were mutually unknown. कुमारिलभट्ट attacks the काशिका on its way in which it defends the compound in जनिकर्तुः and तत्प्रयोजकः। जिनेन्द्रबुद्धि is silent here. He appears to be ignorant of this attack or to have written his commentary earlier. अमोघवृत्ति supports the काशिका regarding those compounds. The chronology of these works therefore starts up likely thus —The date of the भागवति is about 625 A D, of the काशिका is about 650 A D, and of the न्यास is 725—750 A D of the works of कुमारिलभट्ट 750 A D, of भास 775 A D, भट्टोजि 785 A D, of साध 800 A D, of the अमोघवृत्ति 867 A D, of कैयट 1050 A D, of हरदत्त and मैत्रेयरचित 1100 A D, of पुरुषोत्तमदेव 1150 A D, of the दुर्घटवृत्ति by शरणदेव 1172 A D (30)

DACCA UNIVERSITY  
DACCA, 1923

} SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI

(30) The beginning of the दुर्घटवृत्ति is —

“नत्वा शरणदेवेन सर्वज्ञ ज्ञानहेतवे ।

ब्रह्मद्वन्द्वनाम्नोज-कोश-वीक्षाश् भासते ॥ १ ॥

शकसमक्षीपतिवत्सरमान

एकमभोगवपञ्चविताने ।

दुर्घटवृत्तिकारि सुदे वः

कथंविभूषणहारलतेव ॥ २ ॥

एकमभोगवपञ्चानां वितानो विस्तारो विन्यास इति यावदस्ति यस्मिन्निति विग्रहः । तस्मिन्शक-सक्षीपतिवत्सरमान इत्यन्वयः । That is the शक year 1095 which corresponds with 1172 A D.

## THE DESCRIPTION OF THE MSS

USED IN PREPARING THE PRESS COPY

of the काशिकाविवरणपञ्जिका ।

(1) The first MS (घ) contains I 4 (A), II 1 2 3, III I, VII 2 and VII 1 It is owned by the Rajshahi Government College For details, see notes in P 332 and P 790 vol I

(2) The Second MS (ग) contains I 2 3 4 and II 1 2 3 4 Details are given in note P 332 vol I

(3) The third MS (ङ) is with only I 3 and II 4

(4) The 4th MS (च) containing I 2, III 1 2 and VI 1 4, at the end of 1/2 has अश्वत्थशर्मणा लिखितम् । At the end of its 3/2 is श्रीकाशीपतिशर्मण पुस्तकनिर्दिष्टम् । लिखित श्रीजगन्मोहनसेनेन । शकाब्दा १७३० आषाढस्य द्वातैयदिवसे । शक १७३० is 1808 A D Its pages were found torn in some places At the end of 6/4 is

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिचौशीशके सिद्धगते रवी ।

अलिखि न्यासटीकेय श्रीकृष्णानन्दशर्मणा ॥ १ ॥

इन्दुविन्दुमुनिचौशीशक is १७०१ that is 1779 A D Elsewhere is शक १७३२ that is 1817 A D See details in note P 790 vol I

(5) The 5th MS (त) contains VII 1, 2, 3, 4 and VII 1 3 4 At the end of 7/3 is श्रीरस्तु कृष्णनाथशर्मणि and at the end of 8/4, it has

तैलाद्रन जलाद्रन रच मा ज्ञयवत्सनात् ।

आखुभ्य परहस्तेभ्य एव वदति पुस्तिका ॥ १ ॥

नत्वा कालीपदाज निखिलभयहरं शोकसन्तापनाश

यस्याः समुक्तिं निच्छन् सुरपुरि वसता क्षव्य इश सनात् ।

यस्य क्रोधाद् विनष्ट स्त्रिभुवनविजयी तेन सोऽभृद्वनञ्ज

शके न्यास खड्गन्यास्त्रिशशिपरिमिते कृष्णनाथो व्यलेखित ॥ २ ॥

खड्गन्यास्त्रिशशिपरिमितशक is १७००, i e 1778 A D

(6) The Sixth MS (थ) contains III 1

(7) The 7th MS (द) is with III 2 See note P 709, vol I

(8) The 8th MS (ध) is with III 4 See note P 791, vol I

(9) The 9th MS (न) It was from the Deccan College Poona, kindly lent by the late lamented Professor Ghate It has प्रत्याहार, I 1 2 3 4, IV 12 3 4 and V 1 2 3 4 See page 331 and Page 1061 notes, vol I

(A) I I 4 or 1/4 indicates the fourth pada (or section) of the 1st Adhyaya and similarly 2 1 or 2/1 is the 1st pada of the 2nd Adhyaya and so on



(10) The 10th MS (घ) is with V 1 3 Its copyist and owner was one श्रीकान्तशर्मा ।

(11) The 11th MS, (फ) containing II 1,2 VI 3 and VII 1 2 3 4 has at the end लिखिता श्रीरामकान्तशर्मा । A very good and correct MS

(12) The 12th MS, (ब) has 1 3, II 1 2 3, IV 1 VII 1 2 3 4 and VIII 1 4 see note P 484

(13) The 13th MS (क) is with प्रव्याहार, I 1 2 3 and II 1 2 3 4 see note 331 vol I This is the Bengal MS containing the प्रव्याहार and I 1 or the beginning of the न्यास । It is the property and is now in the office, of the वनेन्द्र society

(14) The 14th MS (न) with VIII 3 is from the village शान्तिखा, Rajshahi It has at the end श्रीशिवरामशर्मा खानराम । शकाब्दाः १६४६ 10 1724 A D

(15) The 15th MS (घ) is with VI 4

(16) The 16th MS (ङ) is with 1 4 see note p 332, vol I

(17) The 17th MS (ट) is from the Deccan College, Poona It contains II 1 2 3 4 See note P 484, vol I

(18) The 18th MS (ड) is from the Asiatic Society Bengal Calcutta and has VII 2 and VIII 4 The label is no 8029 काशिकाविवरणपत्रिका जिनेद्रबुद्धिहता सप्तमाध्यायस्य द्वितीय पाद किञ्चिद्गुण । अष्टमाध्यायस्य चतुर्थपादस्य व्याकरणम् । At the end of 8 4, it has

प्रणस्य पार्श्वेतीं देवी श्रीरामपतिशर्मा ।

पुस्तक लिखितश्चेद देवानन्मान् प्रयत्नत ॥ १ ॥

(19) The 19th MS (घ) is also from the aforesaid Society and has VII 3 4 The label is "ग-8/24 Seal AS NS Government Sanskrit MS At the end of 7/3 is श्रीशिवरामशर्मादेवशर्मा खान । At the end of 7/4 is श्रीशिवरामशर्मा इय पुस्तिका ।

(20) The 20th MS (र) is with VII 1 2 3 and VIII 1 1 2 3 At the end of 7/1 is शुभमस्तु शकाब्दाः १६९५ 10 1773 A D At the end of VIII 1 is तिडो गोदादौतीति । अत्र शेषभागस्य दर्शनाभावान्न स लिखित । So it is incomplete Infact the vedic portions of the Book were completely lost in Bengal and from other provinces those have to be procured

(21) The 21st MS (ण) is with II 1, VII 1 4 and VIII 1 3

(22) The 22nd MS (ङ) with III 3 and IV 2 It is a copy written in Devanagar from the MS on the palm leaves in Canarese characters at the Sravan Belgolah Jain Matha in Mysore It was got on 1 7 1915 See note p 791, vol 1

(23) The 23rd MS (ड) with VI 3 4 and VIII 3 4, was got from the village बैद्यवेलचरिया, Rajshahi, from the house of पण्डित शिवचन्द्रसिद्धान्त ।

(24) The 24th MS (ड) is with III 3 See note P 791 vol I

(25) The 25th MS (म) is also a copy in Devanagar certified as duly compared with the original from the aforesaid Sravan Belgolah MS prepared like the copy of the MS XXII Its contents are VI १ २ and VIII १ २

(26) The 28th MS (घ) is with VI २ This is a portion of the Kasmir MS a copy in Devanagar duly compared It has been got from the Superintendent Research Department Srinagar, Jamoo Kasmir State, Kasmir

In our collection, the MSS in Bengali letters were almost all collected from almost all districts of North Bengal In whole Bengal the literate people of Rajshahi Division together with only a very few Tole pundits of Vishnupur in West Bengal, preserved the studies of Panini's grammar from generation to generation

There were in North Bengal countless scholars who used to teach this grammar to their pupils in indogenous system They kept alive specially the study of the Buddhist commentaries viz काशिका, न्यास, तन्त्रप्रदीप, भाषाहृत्ति, &c Many of them have left commentaries of their own on those books One of these is छट्टिधराचार्य the commentator of the भाषाहृत्ति । One सनासन too had commentaries on portions of the काशिका न्यास &c

We may refer here to two TOLE pundits of Bengal of recent time who by their erudition in पाणिनि Grammar, were very much reputed One is pundit शिवचन्द्र मङ्गल of वैद्यवेलचरिया in Nattore, District Rajsahi He was born in 1797 and died in 1867 AD He went to Benares and solicited काकारामशास्त्रिन् for lessons on the महाभाष्य This Sastrin was formerly the court pundit of the Panjab Lion Ranajit Singha शिवचन्द्र had वापुदेवशास्त्रिन् as his classmate there under काकाराम The Bengalis being generally fire-eaters, his prayer was at first rejected शिवचन्द्र used however to daily go to him and sit at a distance listening to his lectures He raised often argumentative objections and they struck and charmed the शास्त्रिन् who ultimately softened and favoured him with giving him lessons directly He returned to his country and proved superior to other Pundits There are some adages concerning his name —

शिव काशीशिव काशीकाशी शिव शिव ।

शिवचन्द्रोदयो यत्र तत्र नास्य पराभव ॥ १ ॥

शिवेन शिवचन्द्रेण सुसिद्धान्तेन धीमता ।

विसर्जने कृता यातु व्याख्यासांबुत्तमोत्तमा ॥ २ ॥

His works are अख्यात्मचण्डो, श्रीमद्भागवतविचार, गृहभाष्यार्थकाशिकी ( रुद्राज्यायटीका ) विधवाविवाहखण्डनम्, वासुदेवविजयमहाकाव्यम्, सिद्धान्तचन्द्रिका (वेदान्तदर्शनटीका), कुलशास्त्रदीपिका, सुधाविन्दु ( पाणिनिव्याकरणटीका ), अभावपदार्थखण्डनम्, दोलयात्राविधिः, विद्वन्मनोरञ्जनकाव्यम्, कालिघटमनकाव्यम्, रसिकोल्लासकाव्यम्, रसिकप्रमोदकाव्यम् । His father's name was राम केशीरतकीलङ्कार ।

The Last Grammarian of the पाणिनि School of North Bengal teaching it in Pote or indogenous system, was one पण्डित पोताम्बरतर्कालङ्कार of the village दौघा in Nattore (Rajshahi). He was the court Pundit of the Maharaja of Nattore. He used to regularly lecture on the भाषावृत्ति, and काशिका. Pupils flocked to him in large numbers, on account of his vast erudition. With his death in 1916, the class of such grammarians of North Bengal was alas extinct.

SRISH CHANDRA CHAKRAVARTI

Dacca University, Dacca, 1923

## ABBREVIATIONS AND THEIR EXPLANATIONS.

(प, ) Stands for परिभाषा ।

(ग, सू) ,, ,, गणसूत्र ।

(उण् ) ,, ,, उणादि सूत्र ।

When a number is put after प, उण्, &c in the above, it means the particular number of the परिभाषा or the उणादि सूत्र, &c as the case may be For instance (प, 15) indicates the परिभाषा no 15 ।

Again (उण् २।१५३) is for the उणादि सूत्र no 153 to be found in the second Pada of these Sutras We have quoted such Sutras only from the पञ्चपादौ of the उणादि Rules

In the case of the Aphorisms or the main Sutras of the अष्टाध्यायी, we have quoted three numbers Of these first figure indicates the Adhyaya (chapter) and the second figure is pada (section) and third is the number of the Sutra in this pada viz : (३।२।४५) Here the 45th Sutra of the second pada of the third Adhyaya of the अष्टाध्यायी is meant and so on in other cases